arXiv:1512.07507v1 [math.AG] 23 Dec 2015

A POLYHEDRAL CHARACTERIZATION OF QUASI-ORDINARY SINGULARITIES

HUSSEIN MOURTADA AND BERND SCHOBER

Abstract. Given an irreducible hypersurface singularity of dimension d (defined by a polynomial $f \in K[[\mathbf{x}]][z]$) and the projection to the affine space defined by $K[[\mathbf{x}]]$, we construct an invariant which detects whether the singularity is quasi-ordinary with respect to the projection. The construction uses a weighted version of Hironaka's characteristic polyhedron and successive embeddings of the singularity in affine spaces of higher dimensions. This permits to see a quasi-ordinary singularity as an "overweight deformation" of a toric variety. A parametrization of $\{f = 0\}$ is then obtained by lifting a parametrization of the toric variety; this yields the roots of f as a polynomial in z and hence a Newton type proof of the Abhyankar-Jung Theorem (Since the 80's there were many attempts to find a proof of the latter type). Moreover, when f is quasi-ordinary and $K = \mathbb{C}$ then our invariant encodes the embedded topology of the singularity $\{f = 0\}$ in a neighbourhood of the origin.

Introduction

Let K be an algebraically closed field of characteristic 0 and let us denote by $K[[\mathbf{x}]]$ the power series ring $K[[x_1, \ldots, x_d]]$, $d \in \mathbb{Z}_+$. The first objects considered in this paper are quasi-ordinary polynomials: a Weierstrass polynomial

$$f = f(\mathbf{x}, z) = z^n + f_1(\mathbf{x})z^{n-1} + \ldots + f_{n-1}(\mathbf{x})z + f_n(\mathbf{x}) \in K[[\mathbf{x}]][z]$$

satisfying $f(\mathbf{0}, 0) = 0$ is said to be quasi-ordinary if its discriminant as a polynomial in z is a monomial up to multiplication by a unit in $K[[\mathbf{x}]]$. A celebrated theorem by Abhyankar and Jung states that the roots of such a polynomial sit in $K[[x_1^{\frac{1}{n}}, \ldots, x_d^{\frac{1}{n}}]]$, see [J] and [A1].

From a different point of view, one can consider the formal quasi-ordinary germ $(V = \{f = 0\}, 0)$; then the singularities of $(V, 0)$ are intimately related to the roots of f. When $d = 1$, i.e. when V is a plane curve, then the Newton algorithm for determining the roots of f gives also a resolution of singularities of V, [Cu]. When $d > 1$, this assertion makes sense thanks to the notion of "characteristic exponents" introduced by Lipman [L]. These invariants are extracted from the roots of f, knowing the fact that the latter belong to $K[[x_1^{\frac{1}{n}}, \ldots, x_d^{\frac{1}{n}}]]$, and it was proved by Gau that they determine the topological type of the singularity $(V, 0)$ (when $K = \mathbb{C}$), see [G]. Lipman also asked how one can construct an embedded

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 14B05, 32S05, 13F25, 14E15.

Key words and phrases. quasi-ordinary singularities, characteristic polyhedron, overweight deformations.

The first author is partially supported by the ANR-12-JS01-0002-01 SUSI.

The second author is supported by Research Fellowships of the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (SCHO 1595/1-1 and SCHO 1595/2-1).

resolution of singularities of $(V,0) \subset (\mathbf{A}^d,0)$ from the characteristic exponents or equivalently from the roots of f. There exist many approaches to this question, e.g. [V], [BMc], [CM].

This leads us to the other important objects for this paper, the invariants of resolutions of singularities. In particular, the two following approaches to prove the existence of an embedded resolution of singularities are crucial in our context. The first approach is to construct an invariant which takes values in a "well ordered set" and to prove that there exists a finite sequence of blowing ups which makes this invariant strictly decrease. Such an invariant should of course detect regularity, but should also not be too sophisticated in order to be able to follow its changes after blowing up. The work of the second author suggests that this type of invariants is very much related to polyhedral invariants, namely to Hironaka's characteristic polyhedra [H], [S2], [CS].

The other approach is to resolve singularities by one toric morphism. This is not always possible if we do not change the ambient space. So the second approach is about finding an embedding in a higher dimensional affine space in such a way that one can resolve the singularities by one toric morphisms, [T], [M], [LMR], [GP2].

In this paper, using a mixture of these two approaches, we build an invariant which detects whether $(V,0)$ is a quasi-ordinary singularity. We first will introduce a weighted version of Hironaka's characteristic polyhedron and build our invariant from the weighted Hironaka polyhedra of successive embeddings of our singularity in a higher dimensional affine spaces. Let us give some details about this construction.

For $c,d \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, let W be a map $W : \mathbb{Z}^d_{\geq 0} \to \mathbb{Q}^c_{\geq 0}$ which is the restriction of a linear map $\mathbb{Q}^d \to \mathbb{Q}^c$. The data W is equivalent to the data of a $c \times d$ matrix that we also denote by W. This map should be thought as a weight map on the monomials of $K[[\mathbf{x}]]$, where we assign to x_i the weight $W(e_i) \in \mathbb{Q}^c_{\geq 0}$ of the i–th unit vector. A special case is the identity $W_0 : \mathbb{Z}^d_{\geq 0} \to \mathbb{Q}^d_{\geq 0}$ determined by the unit matrix Id_d.

Let $f = \sum_{\mathbf{a},b} \rho_{\mathbf{a},b}\, \mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{a}}\, z^b \in K[[\mathbf{x}]][z]$ be a Weierstrass polynomial of degree n. We associate with the projection given by the inclusion $K[[\mathbf{x}]] \hookrightarrow K[[\mathbf{x}]][z]/\langle f\rangle$, and with the weight W, a polyhedron $\Delta^W(\, f;\, \mathbf{x};\, z\,)$ which is defined to be the smallest convex subset of $\mathbb{R}^c_{\geq 0}$ containing all the points of the set

$$\left\{ \frac{W(\mathbf{a})}{n-b} + \mathbb{R}^c_{\geq 0} \;\mid\; \rho_{\mathbf{a},b} \neq 0 \,\wedge\, b < n \right\}.$$

We minimize $\Delta^W(\, f;\, \mathbf{x};\, z\,)$ (for the inclusion) with respect to all changes of variables that respect the inclusion $K[[\mathbf{x}]] \hookrightarrow K[[\mathbf{x}]][z]/\langle f\rangle$ (see section 2).

The polyhedron $\Delta^W(\, f;\, \mathbf{x};\, z\,)$ with respect to some W is closely connected to Hironaka's characteristic polyhedron. In fact, once it is minimal with respect to the choice of z, it is the image of Hironaka's characteristic polyhedron under W.

With these polyhedra we define the notion of ν-quasi-ordinary polynomials with respect to W: f is called ν-quasi-ordinary polynomials with respect to W if the polyhedron $\Delta^W(\, f;\, \mathbf{x};\, z\,)$ has exactly one vertex v that cannot be eliminated by a change of variable in z. This generalizes Hironaka's notion of ν-quasi-ordinary polynomials which are ν-quasi-ordinary polynomials with respect to W_0.

If f is moreover irreducible then we show that the initial form at v, i.e. the sum of those monomials of weight v, is of the form

$$F_{v,W} = in_{v,W}(f) = (Z^m - \rho \mathbf{X}^{\mathbf{a}})^e,$$

for certain $m, e \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, $m \cdot e = n$, $\rho \in K$ and $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{Z}^d_{\geq 0}$ with $\frac{\mathbf{a}}{m} = v$.

The construction of our invariant $\kappa(f; \mathbf{x}; z)$ goes as follows (for a detailed version see Construction 3.1). If f is not ν-quasi-ordinary then set $\kappa(f; \mathbf{x}; z) := (-1)$.

Construction 1. *Let $f \in K[[\mathbf{x}]][z]$ be an irreducible ν-quasi-ordinary polynomial (for $(\mathbf{x}; z)$) of degree n. Denote by $v(1)$ the only vertex of $\Delta^{W_0}(f; \mathbf{x}; z)$ and let $F_{v(1),W_0} = (Z^{n_1} - \rho_1 \mathbf{X}^{\mathbf{a}(1)})^{e_1}$, where $\frac{\mathbf{a}(1)}{n_1} = v(1)$.*

We consider the embedding associated with the map $K[[\mathbf{x}]][z, u_1] \longrightarrow K[[\mathbf{x}]][z]$ where u_1 is sent to $z^{n_1} - \rho_1 \mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{a}(1)}$. Let $f^{(1)}$ be the unique representative of f in

$$\frac{K[[\mathbf{x}]][z, u_1]}{\langle\, u_1 - (z^{n_1} - \rho_1 \mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{a}(1)})\,\rangle}$$

which is obtained by exchanging z^{n_1} in f by $u_1 + \rho_1 \mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{a}(1)}$; therefore we get that $f^{(1)} \in K[[\mathbf{x}]][z]_{<n_1}[u_1]$, i.e. where z appears to the power at most $n_1 - 1$.
We then extend W_0 to a linear map $W_1 : \mathbb{Z}^{d+1}_{\geq 0} \to \mathbb{Q}^d_{\geq 0}$ on $K[[\mathbf{x}]][z]$ by assigning

$$W_1(z) := v(1).$$

If $f^{(1)}$ is ν-quasi-ordinary with respect to W_1 (for $(\mathbf{x}, z; u_1)$) then we repeat the previous step, otherwise we set $\kappa(f; \mathbf{x}; z) := (\, v(1), -1)$. Note that $f^{(1)}$ is of degree $e_1 = \frac{n}{n_1} < n$ in u_1.

After finitely many steps, say $g \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, the construction ends and we define

$$\kappa(f; \mathbf{x}; z) := (\, v(1), \ldots, v(g), \xi\,),$$

where $v(i)$ is the vertex of the polyhedron in the i–th step, $\xi = \infty$ if the polyhedron in the $(g+1)$–th step is empty, and $\xi = -1$ if it has more than one vertex.

The main result of this article is

Theorem 2. *Let $f \in K[[\mathbf{x}]][z]$ be an irreducible ν-quasi-ordinary polynomial of degree n.*

Then f is quasi-ordinary with respect to the projection given by the chosen variables $(\mathbf{x}; z)$ if and only if the last entry of $\kappa(f; \mathbf{x}; z)$ is ∞.

The key ingredient for the proof is that if the last entry is ∞, then after adding the variables $u_1, \ldots, u_g$, our construction yields that the variety $V = \{f = 0\}$ embedded in $\mathbb{A}^{d+g+1}_K$ is the generic fiber of an "overweight deformation" of a toric variety: this is the monomial variety associated with the $v(i)$ which is the closure of the orbit $(s_1^n, \ldots, s_d^n, S^{n \cdot v(1)}, \ldots, S^{n \cdot v(g)})$, where $S = (s_1, \ldots, s_d)$ and $S^{(\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_d)} = s_1^{\alpha_1} \cdots s_d^{\alpha_d}$. Hence we have a parametrization of the toric variety.

Let us explain the overweight deformation a little bit more in detail here: From the construction of our invariant we attain a linear map $W_* : \mathbb{Z}^{d+g}_{\geq 0} \to \mathbb{Q}^d_{\geq 0}$ which can be identified with a weight map

$$W_* : K[[x]][z, u_1, \ldots, u_{g-1}] \longrightarrow \mathbb{Q}^d.$$

Then we can identify the singularity $\{f = 0\}$ embedded in $\mathbb{A}^{d+g+1}_K$ with the fiber $\mathfrak{X}_1$ above $T = 1$ of the map $\mathfrak{X} \longrightarrow \operatorname{Spec} K[T]$, where $\mathfrak{X} = V(F_1, \ldots, F_g)$ denotes the variety defined by $F_t \in K[[x]][z, u_1, \ldots, u_{g-1}, T]$, $t \in \{0, \ldots, g-1\}$, (using multi-index notation and the abbreviation $\mathbf{u}_{<t} = (\, u_0, u_1, \ldots, u_{t-1}\,)$, $u_0 := z$)

$$F_t = T u_{t+1} - u_t^{n_{t+1}} + \rho_t\, \mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{a}} \mathbf{u}^{\mathbf{b}}_{<t} - T \cdot \left(\sum_{(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\beta}, \beta_+)} \mu_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\beta}, \beta_+}\, \mathbf{x}^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}\, \mathbf{u}^{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{<t}\, u_t^{\beta_+} \right),$$

for $\mathbf{a} = \mathbf{a}(t+1) \in \mathbb{Z}^d_{\geq 0}, \mathbf{b} = \mathbf{b}(t+1) \in \mathbb{Z}^t_{\geq 0}, \boldsymbol{\alpha} = \boldsymbol{\alpha}(t+2) \in \mathbb{Z}^d_{\geq 0}, (\boldsymbol{\beta}, \beta_+) = \boldsymbol{\beta}(t+2) \in \mathbb{Z}^{t+1}_{\geq 0}$, and $\rho_t, \mu_{\boldsymbol{\alpha},\boldsymbol{\beta},\beta_+} \in K$, $\rho_t \neq 0$. By convention, $u_g = 0$ and further we have that (using Notation 3 below)

$$\begin{aligned} n_{t+1} \cdot v(t+1) = W_*(u_t^{n_{t+1}}) \quad &= \quad W_*(\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{a}} \mathbf{u}^{\mathbf{b}}_{<t}) \quad <_{poly} \quad W_*(\mathbf{x}^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}} \mathbf{u}^{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{<t} u_t^{\beta_+}), \\ &\qquad W_*(u_t^{n_{t+1}}) \quad <_{poly} \quad W_*(u_{t+1}). \end{aligned}$$

As one can see the fiber $\mathfrak{X}_0$ above $T = 0$ yields the toric variety described above. Using the overweight deformation we can lift the parametrization of the toric variety $\mathfrak{X}_0$ to one of $V = \{f = 0\}$ embedded in $\mathbb{A}^{d+g+1}_K$ after studying the equations of the space of solutions of V in $(K[[S]])^{d+g+1}$. This yields the roots of f and hence its discriminant with respect to z.

For the other direction, assuming that our invariants does not end up with infinity, we apply birational monomial transformations to oblige it to end up with infinity; this permits to find the roots of the new polynomial (after the transformation), to get the roots of the initial polynomial by applying the inverse of the birational map, and to detect that the discriminant with respect to z cannot be a product of a monomial by an invertible. This yields a Newton type proof of the Abhyankar-Jung Theorem which in particular does not use topology, and which works over any algebraically closed field of characteristic zero. Some steps in this direction were made in [Lu], [KV], [PR].

As an other application of our invariant, we prove that $(\, v(1), v(2), \ldots, v(g)\,)$ determine the minimal system of generators of the semi-group of the quasi-ordinary hypersurface f and thus its topology when $K = \mathbb{C}$.

We shall use the notation in bold letters for the tuples $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \ldots, x_d)$, and for $\mathbf{x}^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}} = x_1^{\alpha_1} \cdots x_d^{\alpha_d}$. Throughout the whole paper the product order plays an important role. Therefore let us recall its definition.

Notation 3. *For $v, w \in \mathbb{Q}^d_{\geq 0}$ we have:*

$$\begin{aligned} v \geq_{poly} w \quad &:\Leftrightarrow \quad v \in w + \mathbb{Q}^d_{\geq 0}. \\ v >_{poly} w \quad &:\Leftrightarrow \quad v \geq_{poly} w \ \wedge \ v \neq w. \end{aligned}$$

Note that $v \not\geq_{poly} w$ does not imply $v <_{poly} w$. Further, $v =_{poly} w$ (by which we mean $v \geq_{poly} w$ and $v \leq_{poly} w$) is equivalent to $v = w$.

1. Quasi-ordinary singularities

In this section we collect some facts about quasi-ordinary hypersurface singularities. It is essential to know that the construction of our invariant is independent of these facts and that all of these facts can be seen as corollaries of our characterization of quasi-ordinary singularities.

An equidimensional germ $(V, 0)$ of dimension d is *quasi-ordinary* if there exists a finite projection $\pi : (V, 0) \to (K^d, 0)$ whose branch locus is a normal crossing divisor. If $(V, 0)$ is a hypersurface, $(V, 0) \subset (K^{d+1}, 0)$, then V is defined by a single equation $f = 0$, where $f \in K[[x_1, \ldots, x_d]][z]$ is a Weierstrass polynomial whose discriminant with respect to z is of the form $\Delta_z f = x_1^{\delta_1} \cdots x_d^{\delta_d} \epsilon$, where ϵ is a unit

in $K[[x_1, \ldots, x_d]]$ and $(\delta_1, \ldots, \delta_d) \in \mathbb{Z}^d_{\geqslant 0}$. In these coordinates the projection π is the restriction of the projection

$$K^{d+1} \longrightarrow K^d, \quad (x_1, \ldots, x_d, z) \mapsto (x_1, \ldots, x_d).$$

From now on we assume that $(V, 0)$ is analytically irreducible, i.e. f is irreducible in $K[[x_1, \ldots, x_d]][z]$. A crucial building blog in the theory of quasi-ordinary singularities is

Theorem 1.1. *(Abhyankar-Jung Theorem) Let $f \in K[[\mathbf{x}]][z]$ be a quasi-ordinary polynomial of degree n in z. The roots of f are fractional power series. More precisely, they belong to the ring $K[[x_1^{1/n}, \ldots, x_d^{1/n}]]$.*

Here and in the whole article, we implicitly mean that f is a *Weierstrass* polynomial of degree n in z if we write f is of degree n in z. Sometimes we even omit the reference to z if it is clear from the context.

Actually, one important application of this paper is an elementary proof of this theorem, see Theorem 5.6.

Let $\zeta^{(i)}, i \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$, be the roots of f. The difference $\zeta^{(i)} - \zeta^{(j)}$ of two different roots divides the discriminant of f in the ring $K[[x_1^{1/n}, \ldots, x_d^{1/n}]]$. Therefore

$$\zeta^{(i)} - \zeta^{(j)} = \mathbf{x}^{\lambda_{ij}} \cdot \epsilon_{ij},$$

where ϵ_{ij} is a unit in $K[[x_1^{1/n}, \ldots, x_d^{1/n}]]$. These exponents have been introduced by Lipman in [L]. It follows from Proposition 1.3 in [G] that the exponents λ_{ij} are well ordered with respect to the product ordering $\leq_{poly}$ and so we name them

$$\lambda_1 <_{poly} \lambda_2 <_{poly} \ldots <_{poly} \lambda_g\,,$$

and we call them the *characteristic exponents*.

We can then define the lattices $M_0 := \mathbb{Z}^d$ and $M_i := M_{i-1} + \mathbb{Z}\lambda_i$, for $i \in \{1, \ldots, g\}$. We have that $M_0 \subset M_1 \subset \ldots \subset M_g$ and we set

$$n_i := [M_i, M_{i-1}], \quad i \in \{1, \ldots, g\},$$

where $[M_i, M_{i-1}]$ denotes the index of the subgroup M_{i-1} in M_i.

The importance of these exponents comes from the fact that, when $K = \mathbb{C}$, Gau proves that they determine the topological type of $(V, 0)$.

We can also define an equivalent data to the characteristic exponents ([KM], [GP1]), as follows

$$\gamma_1 = \lambda_1 \ \text{ and } \ \gamma_{i+1} - n_i\gamma_i = \lambda_{i+1} - \lambda_i \quad \text{for } i \in \{1, \ldots, g-1\}, \tag{1.1}$$

Again, the set γ_i, $i \in \{1, \ldots, g\}$ determine the topological type of $(V, 0)$.

2. Weighted characteristic polyhedra

For our characterization we introduce polyhedra with respect to a linear map W. These polyhedra play a crucial role in the construction of our invariant and are a generalization of Hironaka's characteristic polyhedra. (For more details on the latter, see [CS], section 1).

Let $f \in K[[\mathbf{x}]][z]$ a Weierstrass polynomial of degree $n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ in z, i.e.

$$f(\mathbf{x}, z) = z^n + f_1(\mathbf{x})\, z^{n-1} + \ldots + f_n(\mathbf{x}) \tag{2.1}$$

for some $f_i(\mathbf{x}) \in K[[\mathbf{x}]]$, $i \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$. Consider an expansion of f of the form

$$f = \sum_{\mathbf{a},b} \rho_{\mathbf{a},b}\, \mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{a}}\, z^b,$$

for certain $\rho_{\mathbf{a},b} \in K$, and $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{Z}^d_{\geq 0}$, $b \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$.

Further, let

$$W : \mathbb{Z}^d_{\geq 0} \to \mathbb{Q}^c_{\geq 0}\,,$$

for some $c \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, be the map defined by

$$W(e_1) := \alpha_1\,,\ \ W(e_2) := \alpha_2\,,\ \ \ldots\,,\ \ W(e_d) := \alpha_d\,,$$

for certain $\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_d \in \mathbb{Q}^c_{\geq 0}$, and, for $i \in \{1, \ldots, d\}$, e_i denotes the i-th unit-vector of $\mathbb{Z}^d_{\geq 0}$ (i.e. $e_i = (\delta_{ij})_{j \in \{1,\ldots,d\}}$ and δ_{ij} is one if $j = i$ and zero for all j with $j \neq i$).

Clearly, this is the linear map detemined by the $c \times d$ matrix, also denoted by W, with columns given by the vectors $\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_d$,

$$W = (\,\alpha_1 \,|\, \alpha_2 \,|\, \ldots \,|\, \alpha_d\,).$$

For $\mathbf{a} = (a_1, \ldots, a_d) \in \mathbb{Z}^d_{\geq 0}$, we have

$$W(\,\mathbf{a}\,) = \alpha_1 a_1 + \ldots + \alpha_d a_d.$$

Remark 2.1. One may consider W also as a map from the monomials of $K[[\mathbf{x}]]$ to $\mathbb{Q}^c_{\geq 0}$. This means W assigns to x_i the "weight" $\alpha_i \in \mathbb{Q}^c_{\geq 0}$, for all $i \in \{1, \ldots, d\}$. In the following we sometimes write also $W(\,\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{a}}\,)$ when we mean $W(\mathbf{a})$. We refer also to the first section in [T].

Example 2.2.

(1) A first example is the map given by the identity, i.e. $c = d$ and $W(\mathbf{a}) = (\mathbf{a})$. In the following, we denote this special example by W_0.

(2) Let $d = 3$, and $c = 2$. Then another example for such a map is the following $W : \mathbb{Z}^3_{\geq 0} \to \mathbb{Q}^2_{\geq 0}$ (on $K[[x_1, x_2, x_3]]$) which is given by $W = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 2 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$, i.e.

$$W(x_1) = (1, 0), \qquad W(x_2) = (0, 1), \qquad W(x_3) = (2, 1). \tag{2.2}$$

Let us now come to the definition of the polyhedron.

Definition 2.3. Let $f = \sum_{\mathbf{a},b} \rho_{\mathbf{a},b}\, \mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{a}}\, z^b \in K[[\mathbf{x}]][z]$ be a polynomial of degree n and let $W : \mathbb{Z}^d_{\geq 0} \to \mathbb{Q}^c_{\geq 0}$ be a linear map as before.

(1) We define the *Newton polyhedron of* $(f, \mathbf{x}, z)$ *with respect to* W as the smallest convex subset of $\mathbb{R}^{c+1}_{\geq 0}$ containing all the points of the set

$$\left\{ (W(\mathbf{a}), b) + \mathbb{R}^{c+1}_{\geq 0} \ \mid\ \rho_{\mathbf{a},b} \neq 0 \right\}$$

and we use the notation $\Delta^{N,W}(\,f;\, \mathbf{x}, z\,)$.

(2) We define the *associated polyhedron for* $(f, \mathbf{x}, z)$ *with respect to* W as the smallest convex subset of $\mathbb{R}^c_{\geq 0}$ containing all the points of the set

$$\left\{ \frac{W(\mathbf{a})}{n - b} + \mathbb{R}^c_{\geq 0} \ \mid\ \rho_{\mathbf{a},b} \neq 0 \,\wedge\, b < n \right\}$$

and we use the notation $\Delta^{W}(\,f;\, \mathbf{x};\, z\,)$.

Remark 2.4. (1) Based on discussions of the authors a variant of this idea was already mentioned in [S1], Remark 5.9. Besides that there is no reference known to the authors, where such a kind of polyhedron has been considered before. A connected notion has been considered in [As].

(2) The polyhedron $\Delta^W(f;\mathbf{x};z)$ has finitely many vertices. (This follows with the same arguments as in [CP], Proposition 2.1).

Further, one sees easily that the associated polyhedron $\Delta^W(f;\mathbf{x};z)$ is the projection of the Newton polyhedron $\Delta^{N,W}(f;\mathbf{x},z)$ from the point $(\mathbf{0},1)\in\mathbb{R}^{c+1}_{\geq 0}$ onto $\mathbb{R}^c_{\geq 0}$ corresponding to the cooridnates $(\mathbf{x})$.

(3) Since W is a linear map, we have $\frac{W(\mathbf{a})}{n-b}=W\left(\frac{\mathbf{a}}{n-b}\right)$. Hence

$$\Delta^W(f;\mathbf{x};z)=W\left(\Delta(f;\mathbf{x};z)\right), \tag{2.3}$$

where $\Delta(f;\mathbf{x};z)=\Delta^{W_0}(f;\mathbf{x};z)$ is the polyhedron associated to $(f,\mathbf{x},z)$ (see Definition 1.2 in [CS]).

Example 2.5. Let $d=3$, $c=2$, and $W=\begin{pmatrix}1&0&2\\0&1&1\end{pmatrix}$ the linear map defined by (2.2). Consider

$$f=z^2+2zx_1x_2^3+x_1^2x_2^6+x_1^3x_3+x_2^2x_3^3.$$

Then we have

$$\begin{aligned}
W(x_1x_2^3)=(1,3), &\quad\Rightarrow\quad v_1=(1,3),\\
W(x_1^2x_2^6)=(2,6) &\quad\Rightarrow\quad v_2=v_1=(1,3),\\
W(x_1^3x_3)=(5,1), &\quad\Rightarrow\quad v_3:=(\tfrac{5}{2},\tfrac{1}{2}),\\
W(x_2^2x_3^3)=(6,5) &\quad\Rightarrow\quad v_4:=(3,\tfrac{5}{2}),
\end{aligned}$$

where v_i denotes the corresponding point $\frac{W(A)}{n-b}$ in the polyhedron. Thus the vertices of $\Delta^W(f;\mathbf{x};z)$ are $v_1=(1,3)$ and $v_3=(\frac{5}{2},\frac{1}{2})$, whereas $v_4=(3,\frac{5}{2})$ lies in the interior.

If we put $y:=z+x_1x_2^3$, then $f=y^2+x_1^3x_3+x_2^2x_3^3$. Clearly, the point v_1 does not appear in $\Delta^W(f;\mathbf{x};y)$ which has only v_3 as vertex. Moreover, v_3 can not be eliminated by a further change of y. This means the polyhedron $\Delta^W(f;\mathbf{x};y)$ is minimal with respect to the choice of y, in the sense that there is no choice $\widetilde{y}$ for y such that $\Delta^W(f;\mathbf{x};\widetilde{y})\subsetneq\Delta^W(f;\mathbf{x};y)$

Choices for z: As we have seen, the polyhedron $\Delta^W(f;\mathbf{x};z)$ depends heavily on the choice of z. Thus we seek for $\widetilde{z}$, where $\widetilde{z}=z+h(\mathbf{x})$, for some $h(\mathbf{x})\in K[[\mathbf{x}]]$, such that $\Delta^W(f;\mathbf{x};\widetilde{z})\subset\mathbb{R}^c_{\geq 0}$ becomes minimal with respect to inclusion. For quasi-ordinary singularities one can achieve this by considering so called P-good coordinates (see for example [ACLM], Definition 3.1 and Lemma 4.6).

More generally, since K has characteristic zero, we can choose z in such a way that it has maximal contact with f. Thus we attain the desired change in z by performing the so called Tschirnhausen transformation: Given any z such that f is of degree n as in (2.1), we set

$$\widetilde{z}:=z+\frac{1}{n}\cdot f_1(\mathbf{x}).$$

This determines a hypersurface of maximal contact for f and we can replace z by $\widetilde{z}$. Then we get

$$f(\mathbf{x},z)=\widetilde{z}^n+g_2(\mathbf{x})\,\widetilde{z}^{n-2}+\ldots+g_n(\mathbf{x})$$

for some $g_i(\mathbf{x}) \in K[[\mathbf{x}]]$, $i \in \{2, \ldots, n\}$, and $g_1(\mathbf{x}) \equiv 0$. By Proposition 6.1 in [S1] the associated polyhedron $\Delta(f; \mathbf{x}; \widetilde{z})$ is minimal with respect to choices for $\widetilde{z}$ and since $\Delta^W(f; \mathbf{x}; \widetilde{z}) = W(\Delta(f; \mathbf{x}; \widetilde{z}))$, the same is true for $\Delta^W(f; \mathbf{x}; \widetilde{z})$.

Remark 2.6. The desired $\widetilde{z}$ can also be achieved by the following step-by-step process: Consider the given coordinates $(\mathbf{x}, z)$. We equip $\mathbb{R}^c_{\geq 0}$ with the total order given by the lexicographical order of the entries of a vector $v \in \mathbb{R}^c_{\geq 0}$. In the following we use the words *smallest* or *smaller* always with respect to this chosen total order.

Let $v \in \mathbb{Q}^c_{\geq 0}$ be the smallest vertex of $\Delta^W(f; \mathbf{x}; z)$. Remember that W is defined by vectors $\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_d \in \mathbb{Q}^c_{\geq 0}$. If v is contained in the semi-group generated by these vectors (i.e. if $v \in \alpha_1\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} + \ldots + \alpha_d\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \subset \mathbb{Z}^c_{\geq 0}$) then there is the chance to eliminate v by a change $z \mapsto z + h_v(\mathbf{x})$. Here, $h_v(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{\mathbf{a}} \mu_{\mathbf{a}} \mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{a}} \in K[[\mathbf{x}]]$ and those $\mathbf{a}$ with $\mu_{\mathbf{a}} \neq 0$ fulfil $W(\mathbf{a}) = \alpha_1 a_1 + \ldots + \alpha_d a_d = v$. (Note that relations as, for example, $2\alpha_1 + 3\alpha_2 = v = 2\alpha_2 + \alpha_3$ might hold, i.e. the linear equations $W(\mathbf{a}) = v \in \mathbb{Q}^c_{\geq 0}$ might have more than one solution).

Suppose it is possible to eliminate the vertex v. Then we perform the change $z \mapsto z' := z + h_v(\mathbf{x})$ as described before with appropriate constants $\mu_{\mathbf{a}}$ and we consider the polyhedron with respect to z'. Then we pick the smallest element in the set of vertices (which is bigger than the previous one with respect to the chosen total order) and try to eliminate this one and so on.

If it is not possible to eliminate the smallest vertex, then we go on and consider the next smallest vertex and try to eliminate that one and so on.

By doing this (possibly not finite) process we end up with a certain element $\widetilde{z} = z + h(\mathbf{x})$, where $h(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{\mathbf{a}} \mu_{\mathbf{a}} x^{\mathbf{a}} \in k[[\mathbf{x}]]$, such that $\Delta^W(f; \mathbf{x}; \widetilde{z})$ is minimal with respect to changes in $\widetilde{z}$.

Changes in $(\mathbf{x})$: In our context a good choice for the variables $(\mathbf{x})$ is also important if $W = W_0$; for example, consider the polyhedron with respect to W_0 for $f(\mathbf{x}, z) = z^2 + x_1^2(x_1 + x_2)$ and compare it with the one for $f(\mathbf{y}, z) = z^2 + y_1^2 y_2$, where $y_1 := x_1$ and $y_2 := x_1 + x_2$. Therefore one may ask if there exist choices for $(\mathbf{x}, z)$ such that the polyhedron $\Delta^{W_0}(f; \mathbf{x}; z)$ is minimal with respect to inclusion in $\mathbb{R}^c_{\geq 0}$. (Of course, one may ask this question in the more general case for arbitrary W, but since this is becoming more complicated and since it is not needed here, we do not discuss this).

We want to make only changes in $(\mathbf{x}, z)$ which respect the projection of the singularity determined by f onto the affine space given by the variables $(\mathbf{x})$, i.e. on the level of rings which respect the inclusion

$$K[[\mathbf{x}]] \hookrightarrow K[[\mathbf{x}]][z]/\langle f \rangle. \tag{2.4}$$

Thus we seek for $(\widetilde{\mathbf{x}}, \widetilde{z})$, where $\widetilde{x_i} = x_i + h_i(\mathbf{x})$ and $\widetilde{z} = z + h(\mathbf{x})$, for some $h_i(x), h(x) \in K[[\mathbf{x}]]$ $(i \in \{1, \ldots, d\})$, such that $\Delta^W(f; \widetilde{\mathbf{x}}; \widetilde{z}) \subset \mathbb{R}^c_{\geq 0}$ becomes minimal with respect to inclusion. (Note that we use for $(\widetilde{\mathbf{x}})$ also the map W_0 induced by the identity; in particular, we do not require any compatibility with the original W_0 defined by $(\mathbf{x})$; for example, we allow a change of the form $\widetilde{x}_2 := x_2 + x_1$).

The coordinates $(\widetilde{\mathbf{x}}, \widetilde{z})$ can be constructed in the following way: As before we equip $\mathbb{Q}^c_{\geq 0}$ with the total ordering given by the lexicographical order of the entries. First, we change z to $\widetilde{z}$ as above such that $\Delta^{W_0}(f; \mathbf{x}; \widetilde{z})$ becomes minimal with respect to the choice of $\widetilde{z}$. If $\Delta^{W_0}(f; \mathbf{x}; \widetilde{z})$ has only one vertex or is empty, then it is minimal with respect to the choice of $(\mathbf{x})$ and we are done.

Suppose the latter is not the case. Consider the two smallest vertices and try to eliminate one of them by changes in $(\mathbf{x})$ respecting (2.4). If this is not possible, the smallest vertex is fixed and we compare the next two smallest vertices and so on.

If we can eliminate one of the vertices by changing $(\mathbf{x})$, then we perfom this change and start over again. Note that the condition $f_1(\mathbf{x}) \equiv 0$ is stable under the considered changes in $(\mathbf{x})$.

In the case of a quasi-ordinary hypersurface singularity this process will end with a polyhedron that has exactly one vertex or is empty. Thus in our context the obtained polyhedron will be unique.

Remark 2.7.
(1) Suppose z is such that $\Delta(\, f;\, \mathbf{x};\, z\,) := \Delta^{W_0}(\, f;\, \mathbf{x};\, z\,)$ is minimal with respect to the choice for z. Then the (unique!) polyhedron obtained coincides with Hironaka's characteristic polyhedron. (See for example, Definition 1.7 and Theorem 1.8 in [CS]). By (2.3) this implies that for any linear map W the polyhedron $\Delta^W(\, f;\, \mathbf{x};\, z\,)$ is also minimal with respect to the choice of z.
(2) One could make the definition of $\Delta^W(\, f;\, \mathbf{x};\, z\,)$ more general by allowing a whole system of variables $(\mathbf{z}) = (z_1, \ldots, z_c)$ or by extending W to $K[[\mathbf{x}]][\mathbf{z}]$. In fact, one might even replace $K[[\mathbf{x}]][\mathbf{z}]$ by a regular local ring R with regular system of parameters $(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z})$ and may consider instead of an element f an ideal $J \subset R$. Similar ideas have been discussed in [S1], Remark 5.9. Since this is not important for our aim, we do not discuss these things in more detail.

For the later use (Lemma 3.3) we introduce in our special situation the notion of ν-quasi-ordinary singularities with respect to a linear map $W : \mathbb{Z}^d_{\geq 0} \to \mathbb{Q}^c_{\geq 0}$. This generalizes the notion of ν-quasi-ordinary polynomial which was introduced by Hironaka; more precisely, f is ν-quasi-ordinary if it is ν-quasi-ordinary with respect to W_0.

Definition 2.8. Let $f \in K[[\mathbf{x}]][z]$ be of degree n and let $W : \mathbb{Z}^d_{\geq 0} \to \mathbb{Q}^c_{\geq 0}$ be a linear map. Suppose that $(\mathbf{x}, z)$ are such that $\Delta^W(\, f;\, \mathbf{x};\, z\,)$ is minimal. Then we say f is *ν-quasi-ordinary with respect to W* and with respect to the projection determined by $(\mathbf{x}, z)$ if $\Delta^W(\, f;\, \mathbf{x};\, z\,)$ has exactly one vertex, say $v \in \mathbb{Q}^c_{\geq 0}$.

Let us to point out that the definition can easily be extended to arbitrary ideals J instead of a single irreducible Weierstrass polynomial f. Since this general form is not needed in our context, we stay in the special case $J = \langle f \rangle$.

Since we have assumed f to be an irreducible Weierstrass polynomial, we see that the Newton polyhedron $\Delta^{N,W}(\, f;\, \mathbf{x}, z\,)$ must have a one-dimensional face starting from the point $(\mathbf{0}, n) \in \mathbb{Q}^{c+1}_{\geq 0}$ and projecting down to the point v. In particular, v can not be eliminated by changes in z and thus the same is true for the described face in the Newton polyhedron. Clearly, this condition on the Newton polyhedron is equivalent to the one given in the definition.

For $W = W_0$ we obtain the usual definition of ν-quasi-ordinary polynomials (see for example, [ACLM], Definition 1.11) for these special shaped f. The equality (2.3) shows that a ν-quasi-ordinary polynomial is ν-quasi-ordinary polynomial with respect to any linear map W.

On the other hand, it is not hard to give an example of a polynomial which is ν-quasi-ordinary with respect to some $W \neq W_0$ but which is not ν-quasi-ordinary in the usual sense.

Definition 2.9. Let $f = \sum_{\mathbf{a},b} \rho_{\mathbf{a},b}\, \mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{a}}\, z^b \in K[[\mathbf{x}]][z]$ be of degree n as before. Let $W : \mathbb{Z}^d_{\geq 0} \to \mathbb{Q}^c_{\geq 0}$, $c \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, be the linear map determined by vectors $\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_d \in \mathbb{Q}^c_{\geq 0}$. Let $v \in \Delta^W(\, f;\, \mathbf{x};\, z\,)$ be a vertex of the associated polyhedron.

We define the *initial form of f at v with respect to W* by

$$F_{v,W} := in_{v,W}(f) := Z^n + \sum_{(\mathbf{a},b)\,:\,(*)} \rho_{\mathbf{a},b}\, X^{\mathbf{a}}\, Z^b \in K[\mathbf{X}, Z],$$

where the sum ranges over those $(\mathbf{a}, b) \in \mathbb{Z}^{d+1}_{\geq 0}$ fulfilling

$$\frac{W(\mathbf{a})}{n-b} = v\,. \tag{$*$}$$

Since $F_{v,W}$ lies in the graded ring with respect to W we use capital letter. Note that $F_{v,W} \neq Z^n$ since v is a point appearing in the polyhedron.

Example 2.10. Consider $f = u^2 - x^{21} - x^{18}z^3 \in K[[x,z]][u]$. Let $W : \mathbb{Z}^2_{\geq 0} \to \mathbb{Q}_{\geq 0}$ be the linear map defined by $W(x) = 1$ and $W(z) = 1$. Then $\Delta^W(\, f;\, \mathbf{x};\, z\,)$ has only the vertex $v = \frac{21}{2}$ and

$$F_{v,W} = U^2 - X^{21} - X^{18}Z^3.$$

In Example 3.6 the previous situation will appear again. In particular, then it will be more clear why we choose here these names for the variables and this particular W.

Of course, it was not used in the previous definition that f is irreducible. Moreover, we want to point out that f being irreducible does not imply $F_{v,W} = (Z^{n_1} + \rho_0 \mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{a}(0)})^{e_1}$, for some $\rho_0 \in K$, $n_1, e_1 \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ and $\mathbf{a}(0) \in \mathbb{Z}^d_{\geq 0}$:

In fact, the possible shape of $F_{v,W}$ is connected with the question how many solution the linear system $W(\mathbf{a}) = v \in \mathbb{Q}^c_{\geq 0}$ has. If there is a unique solution, say $\mathbf{a}(1) \in \mathbb{Z}^d_{\geq 0}$, and if f is irreducible, then $F_{v,W} = (Z^{n_1} + \rho_{\mathbf{a}(1)}\, \mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{a}(1)})^{e_1}$, for some $\rho_{\mathbf{a}(1)} \in K$ and $e_1, n_1 \in \mathbb{Z}_+$. For example, this is the case for the usual ν-quasi-ordinary polynomials, i.e. which are ν-quasi-ordinary with respect to W_0 (see for example Corollary 1.14 in [ACLM]).

Another special case that appears in the remaining part several times is the following

Lemma 2.11. *Let $\gamma_1 \in \frac{1}{n_1} \cdot \mathbb{Z}^d_{\geq 0}$, …, $\gamma_j \in \frac{1}{n_j} \cdot \mathbb{Z}^d_{\geq 0}$, for some $n_1, \ldots, n_j \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 2}$. Suppose $\gamma_i \notin \mathbb{Z}^d_{\geq 0} + \gamma_1\mathbb{Z} + \ldots + \gamma_{i-1}\mathbb{Z}$, for all $i \in \{1, \ldots, j\}$. Let $W : \mathbb{Z}^{d+j}_{\geq 0} \to \mathbb{Q}^d_{\geq 0}$ be the linear map defined by the matrix $(\, Id_d \,|\, \gamma_1 \,|\, \ldots \,|\, \gamma_j\,)$, where Id_d denotes the $d \times d$ identity matrix.*

Then, for every $v \in \mathbb{Z}^d + \gamma_1\mathbb{Z} + \ldots + \gamma_j\mathbb{Z}$, the equation $W(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}) = v$ has a unique solution $(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}) = (a_1, \ldots, a_d, b_1, \ldots, b_j) \in \mathbb{Z}^{d+j}$ with $b_1 < n_1$, …, $b_j < n_j$.

Here, we have $F_{v,W} = (Z^{n_{j+1}} + \rho_{\mathbf{a},\mathbf{b}}\, \mathbf{x}^{(\mathbf{a},\mathbf{b})})^{e_{j+1}}$, where $(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b})$ denotes the unique solution of $W(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}) = v$ and $\rho_{\mathbf{a},\mathbf{b}} \in K$ and $e_{j+1}, n_{j+1} \in \mathbb{Z}_+$.

3. The invariant and the main theorem

Using the polyhedron introduced in the previous section we can now give the construction of our invariant. The main result which we also state in this section is that the invariant detects whether a given irreducible hypersurface singularity is quasi-ordinary or not. But first, we need some simple techniques.

Let $G = \sum_{(\mathbf{a},b)} \rho_{\mathbf{a},b}\, \mathbf{X}^{\mathbf{a}}\, Z^b$, $\rho_{\mathbf{a},b} \in K$, be an element in $K[\mathbf{X}, Z]$. Whenever we speak of *the lift g of G back to the original ring* $K[[\mathbf{x}]][z]$, we mean the element defined by passing to small letters with the same coefficients, i.e.

$$g := \sum_{(\mathbf{a},b)} \rho_{\mathbf{a},b}\, \mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{a}}\, z^b \in K[\mathbf{x}, z] \subset K[[\mathbf{x}]][z] \tag{3.1}$$

Further, we need the following: Set

$$u := z^m - h(\mathbf{x}, z),$$

for some $m \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ and $h(\mathbf{x}, z) \in K[[\mathbf{x}]]$ with $\deg_z(\, h(\mathbf{x}, z)\,) < m$. Any element in $K[[\mathbf{x}]][z]$ can be uniquely (!) expressed as an element in

$$K[[\mathbf{x}]][z]_{<m}[u] := \{ \sum_{(\mathbf{a},b,c)\in\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^{d+2}} \mu_{\mathbf{a},b,c}\, \mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{a}}\, z^b\, w^c \;\mid\; \mu_{\mathbf{a},b,c} \in K \,\wedge\, 0 \leq b < m \,\}\,, \tag{3.2}$$

i.e. where the only powers of z which may appear are $z, z^2, \ldots, z^{m-1}$; whenever z^m appears it is replaced by $u + h(\mathbf{x}, z)$.

We can identify $K[[\mathbf{x}]][z]_{<m}[u]$ with $K[[\mathbf{x}]][z, u]/\langle\, u - (z^m - h(\mathbf{x}, z))\,\rangle$, where we choose the representant of a class uniquely as an element in (3.2).

Now, we can give the construction of the invariant

$$\kappa = (\, \kappa_1\, ;\, \ldots\, ;\, \kappa_g\, ;\, \kappa_{g+1}\,), \qquad g \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0},$$

which we use to characterize quasi-ordinary singularities.

Construction 3.1. Let $f = \sum_{\mathbf{a},b} \rho_{\mathbf{a},b}\, \mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{a}}\, z^b \in K[[\mathbf{x}]][z]$ be an irreducible polynomial of degree n. First, we consider the polyhedron of f with respect to $W = W_0$ on $K[[\mathbf{x}]]$. (Recall: $W_0(\mathbf{a}) = \mathbf{a}$). Set

$$\Delta^0(\, f;\, \mathbf{x};\, z\,) := \Delta^{W_0}(\, f;\, \mathbf{x};\, z\,)$$

As described in the previous section we minimize $\Delta^0(\, f;\, \mathbf{x};\, z\,)$ with respect to the choice of $(\mathbf{x}, z)$ respecting the inclusion $K[[\mathbf{x}]] \hookrightarrow K[[\mathbf{x}]][z]/\langle f\rangle$. Hence we assume that $(\mathbf{x}, z)$ are such that $\Delta^0(\, f;\, \mathbf{x};\, z\,)$ is minimal.

Then we define the first entry of $\kappa = \kappa(f; \mathbf{x}; z)$ by

$$\kappa_1 := \begin{cases} v(1)\,, & \text{if } \Delta^0(\, f;\, \mathbf{x};\, z\,) \text{ has exactly one vertex } v(1),\\ \infty\,, & \text{if } \Delta^0(\, f;\, \mathbf{x};\, z\,) = \emptyset \text{ is empty},\\ -1\,, & \text{else.}\end{cases}$$

If we are not in the first case then the construction ends and $\kappa := (\, \kappa_1\,)$.

Suppose $\Delta^0(\, f;\, \mathbf{x};\, z\,)$ has exactly one vertex $v(1)$. Then we can write the initial form of f at the vertex $v(1)$ (Definition 2.9) as

$$F_{v(1),W_0} = (Z^{n_1} - \rho_1 \mathbf{X}^{\mathbf{a}(1)})^{e_1},$$

for certain $n_1, e_1 \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, $n = n_1 e_1$, $\rho_1 \in K$ and $\mathbf{a}(1) \in \mathbb{Z}^d_{\geq 0}$ the unique solution for $W_0(a(1)) = n_1 \cdot v(1)$ (Lemma 2.11).

Note that we have $n_1 > 1$ (and thus $e_1 < n$) because otherwise we can eliminate the vertex $v(1)$. We set

$$u_1 := z^{n_1} - \rho_1 \mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{a}(1)}.$$

Expand f as an element in $K[[\mathbf{x}]][z]_{<n_1}[u_1]$ as in (3.2), i.e.

$$f^{(1)} := f = \sum_{(\mathbf{a},b,c) \in \mathbb{Z}^{d+2}_{\geq 0}} \mu_{\mathbf{a},b,c}\, \mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{a}}\, z^b\, u_1^c$$

with $0 \leq b < n_1$ and certain coefficients $\mu_{\mathbf{a},b,c} \in K$. Since f is a polynomial of degree n in z we obtain that $f^{(1)}$ is a polynomial of degree $e_1 = \frac{n}{n_1}$ in u_1. Note that we have passed in the last step from $K[[\mathbf{x}]][z]$ to $K[[\mathbf{x}]][z]_{<n_1}[u_1]$ (resp. $K[[\mathbf{x}]][z, u_1]/\langle\, u_1 - (z^{n_1} - \rho_1 \mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{a}(1)})\,\rangle$).

We extend W_0 from $K[[\mathbf{x}]]$ to a linear map $W_1 : \mathbb{Z}^{d+1}_{\geq 0} \to \mathbb{Q}^d_{\geq 0}$ on $K[[\mathbf{x}]][z]$ via

$$\begin{array}{rcll} W_1(x_i) & := & W_0(x_i)\,, & \text{for all } 1 \leq i \leq d\,, \\ W_1(z) & := & v(1) = (v(1)_1, \ldots, v(1)_d). & \end{array}$$

This finishes the first cycle of the construction and we call $f^{(1)}$ the transform of f under the first cycle.

Suppose we have finished $t \geq 1$ cycles and the construction did not end so far. For notational convenience we put

$$f^{(0)} := f \in K[[\mathbf{x}]][z], \qquad u_0 := z \qquad \text{and} \qquad e_0 := n.$$

Then the first t entries of κ are given by $(\, v(1);\, v(2);\, \ldots;\, v(t)\,)$ and the given data is

$$f^{(t)} \in K[[\mathbf{x}]][u_0]_{<n_1}[u_1]_{<n_2} \cdots [u_{t-1}]_{<n_t}[u_t],$$

which is of degree e_t in u_t, and $e_t < e_{t-1} < \ldots < e_1 < e_0$. Further, W_0 got extended to a linear map on $K[[\mathbf{x}]][u_0, u_1, \ldots, u_{t-1}]$,

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{rcll} & & W_t : \mathbb{Z}^{d+t}_{\geq 0} \to \mathbb{Q}^d_{\geq 0} & \\ W_t(x_i) & := & W_0(x_i)\,, & \text{for all } 1 \leq i \leq d\,, \\ W_t(u_j) & := & v(j+1) \in \mathbb{Q}^d_{\geq 0}\,, & \text{for all } 0 \leq j \leq t-1\,. \end{array} \right. \tag{3.3}$$

We consider the polyhedron associated to the given data

$$\Delta_t := \Delta^{W_t}(\, f^{(t)};\, \mathbf{x}, u_0, \ldots, u_{t-1};\, u_t\,) \subset \mathbb{R}^d_{\geq 0}$$

and try to minimize it by changes in u_t,

$$u_t \mapsto u_t + h(\mathbf{x}, u_0, u_1, \ldots, u_{t-1}).$$

Suppose u_t is such that Δ_t is minimal. Then we define

$$\kappa_{t+1} := \left\{ \begin{array}{ll} v(t+1)\,, & \text{if } \Delta_t \text{ has exactly one vertex } v(t+1), \\ \infty\,, & \text{if } \Delta_t = \emptyset \text{ is empty}, \\ -1\,, & \text{else.} \end{array} \right.$$

If we are in the first case, then

$$F^{(t)}_{v(t+1),W_t} = in_{v(t+1),W_t}(f^{(t)}) = (U_t^{n_{t+1}} - G_{t+1})^{e_{t+1}},$$

for $n_{t+1}, e_{t+1} \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, $e_t = n_{t+1}e_{t+1}$, and $G_{t+1} \in K[\mathbf{X}][Z]_{<n_1}[U_1]_{<n_2} \cdots [U_{t-1}]_{<n_t}$, given by

$$G_{t+1} = \sum_{\mathbf{a}(t+1),\mathbf{b}(t+1)\,:\,(3.4)} \rho_{\mathbf{a}(t+1),\mathbf{b}(t+1)}\, \mathbf{X}^{\mathbf{a}(t+1)}\, Z^{\mathbf{b}(t+1)_1}\, U_1^{\mathbf{b}(t+1)_2} \cdots U_{t-1}^{\mathbf{b}(t+1)_t},$$

$\rho_{\mathbf{a}(t+1),\mathbf{b}(t+1)} \in K$ and is only non-zero for those $\mathbf{a}(t+1) \in \mathbb{Z}^d_{\geq 0}, \mathbf{b}(t+1) \in \mathbb{Z}^t_{\geq 0}$ which fulfil

$$\frac{W_t(\,\mathbf{a}(t+1),\, \mathbf{b}(t+1)\,)}{n_{t+1}} = v(t+1) \tag{3.4}$$

Note that $n_{t+1} > 1$ and thus $e_{t+1} < e_t$. We pick a lift $g_{t+1} \in K[\mathbf{x}, z]$ of G_{t+1} as in (3.1) and set

$$u_{t+1} := u_t^{n_{t+1}} - g_{t+1}. \tag{3.5}$$

Finally, we expand $f^{(t)} = f$ as an element in

$$K[[\mathbf{x}]][u_0]_{<n_1}[u_1]_{<n_2} \cdots [u_{t-1}]_{<n_t}[u_t]_{<n_{t+1}}[u_{t+1}],$$

denote the obtained element by $f^{(t+1)}$ and extend W_t to W_{t+1} as in (3.3) by putting $W_{t+1}(u_t) := v(t+1)$.

Since $n = e_0 > e_1 > \ldots > e_t \geq 1$, the construction ends after finitely many cycles, say after $g \geq 1$ cycles, and we obtain

$$\kappa := \kappa(f; \mathbf{x}; z) := (\, v(1);\, v(2);\, \ldots;\, v(g);\, \xi\,),$$

with $\xi \in \{\infty, -1\}$.

(End of Construction 3.1).

Let us point out that we perform only in the first cycle changes in $(\mathbf{x})$. In particular, $(\mathbf{x}, u_0, \ldots, u_t)$ are fixed in the $(t+1)$-st cycle of the construction, $t \geq 1$.

Remark 3.2. (1) Roughly speaking, the characterization theorem below will state that if κ ends with ∞, then the given f is quasi-ordinary with respect to the projection $(\mathbf{x}, z)$.

On the other hand, if the last entry of κ is -1 then f is not quasi-ordinary with respect to the chosen projection. But still f might be quasi-ordinary with respect to another choice of the projection, see Example 3.11.

(2) In each cycle of the construction we embed the singularity into an ambient space with one dimension more. From this we then obtain refined information on the hypersurface. This is highly motivated by Teissier's approach to local uniformization for Abhyankar valuations, see [T]. His idea is to embed a given singularity into a suitable higher dimensional ambient space such that it becomes an overweight deformation of a toric variety. Then a local resolution of the original singularity can be obtained from that of the associated toric variety.

(3) Moreover, this construction is slightly connected to the invariant by Bierstone and Milman for constructive resolution of singularities in characteristic zero, see [BM1] or [BM2]. In [S2] the second author connected their invariant with certain polyhedra. More precisely, at the beginning $\delta(f) := |v(1)| = v(1)_1 + \ldots + v(1)_d$ is the resolution invariant for f . Therefore, $v(1) \in \mathbb{Q}^d_{\geq 0}$ is a refined information of $\delta(f) \in \mathbb{Q}_{\geq 0}$ and $v(t+1)$

can be interpret as a generalization of $\delta(f^{(t)})$ to a situation with weighted coordinates.

Recall that we defined in Definition 2.8 f to be ν-quasi-ordinary with respect to W if $\Delta^W(\, f;\, \mathbf{x};\, z\,)$ has exactly one vertex. Then the following is an easy consequence of Construction 3.1:

Lemma 3.3. *Let f and $(\mathbf{x}, z)$ be as in Construction 3.1. Then*

$$\kappa(f; \mathbf{x}; z) = (\, v(1);\, v(2);\, \ldots;\, v(g);\, \infty\,)$$

if and only if the successive transforms $f^{(t)} \in K[[\mathbf{x}]][u_0]_{<n_1}[u_1]_{<n_2} \cdots [u_{t-1}]_{<n_t}[u_t]$ of f are ν-quasi-ordinary with respect to W_t, for all $t \in \{0, \ldots, g\}$. In particular, they are ν-quasi-ordinary with respect to $W_* := W_g$.

Using Lemma 2.11 and [GG] one can show

Lemma 3.4. *Let $f \in K[[\mathbf{x}]][z]$ be an irreducible polynomial of degree n. Let $\gamma_1 := v(1), \ldots \gamma_g := v(g)$ be the entries of the invariant κ except for the last one (Construction 3.1).*

Then we have, for every $t \in \{0, \ldots, g-1\}$,

$$\gamma_{t+1} \notin \mathbb{Z}^d_{\geq 0} + \gamma_1\mathbb{Z} + \ldots + \gamma_t\mathbb{Z}.$$

If f is moreover ν-quasi-ordinary with respect to some W and if v denotes the unique vertex of $\Delta^W(\, f;\, \mathbf{x};\, z\,)$, then this implies

$$F_{v,W} = in_{v,W}(f) = (Z^m - \rho\mathbf{X}^{\mathbf{a}})^e,$$

for certain $m, e \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, $m \cdot e = n$, $\rho \in K$ and $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{Z}^d_{\geq 0}$ with $\frac{\mathbf{a}}{m} = v$. In particular, (3.4) *has a unique solution $(\mathbf{a}(t+1), b(t+1))$ and we get in* (3.5)

$$g_{t+1} = \rho_t\, \mathbf{X}^{\mathbf{a}(t+1)}\, Z^{\mathbf{b}(t+1)_1}\, U_1^{\mathbf{b}(t+1)_2} \cdots U_{t-1}^{\mathbf{b}(t+1)_t}$$

for some $\rho_t \in K$

Observation 3.5. Recall that we set $u_0 := z$. When the construction ends, we have

$$f = f^{(g)} \in K[[\mathbf{x}]][u_0]_{<n_1}[u_1]_{<n_2} \cdots [u_{g-1}]_{<n_g}[u_g]$$

and $\Delta^{W_g}(\, f^{(g)};\, \mathbf{x}, u_0, \ldots, u_{g-1};\, u_g\,)$ (with u_g such that the polyhedron is minimal) is either empty or has more than one vertex. If the polyhedron is empty, then $f^{(g)} = u_g$.

Furthermore, we constructed an extension of $W_0 : \mathbb{Z}^d_{\geq 0} \to \mathbb{Q}^d_{\geq 0}$ (on $K[[\mathbf{x}]]$) to

$$W_* := W_g : \mathbb{Z}^d_{\geq 0} \times \mathbb{Z}^g_{\geq 0} \to \mathbb{Q}^d_{\geq 0} \qquad (\text{ on } K[[\mathbf{x}]][u_0, u_1, \ldots, u_{g-1}]\,),$$
$$W_*(u_j) := W_s(u_j) = v(j+1), \qquad \text{for all } 0 \leq j \leq g-1,$$

where $v(j+1)$ is the unique vertex of $\Delta^{W_j}(\, f^{(j)};\, \mathbf{x}, u_0, \ldots, u_{j-1};\, u_j\,)$ (and u_j is assumed to be chosen such that the polyhedron is minimal). The linear map W_* is determined by the $d \times (d+g)$ matrix with the $d \times d$ identity matrix Id_d at first and then the matrix with columns given by the $v(j+1)$, $0 \leq j \leq g-1$, i.e.

$$W_* = (\, Id_d \,|\, v(1) \,|\, v(2) \,|\, \cdots \,|\, v(g)\,). \tag{3.6}$$

Let us abbreviate:

$$\left\{\begin{array}{rcl} \mathbf{u}_{<t} & := & (\, u_0,\, u_1,\, \ldots,\, u_{t-1}\,) \\ \mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{a}}\mathbf{u}^{\mathbf{b}}_{<t} & := & \mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{a}(t+1)}\, u_0^{\mathbf{b}(t+1)_1}\, u_1^{\mathbf{b}(t+1)_2} \cdots u_{t-1}^{\mathbf{b}(t+1)_t} \end{array}\right. \tag{3.7}$$

Then using (3.5) and further taking into account that we do some minimizing process for the polyhedron $\Delta^{W_{t+1}}(\, f^{(t+1)};\, \mathbf{x}, u_{<t+1};\, u_{t+1}\,)$, we obtain for every $t \geq 0$

$$u_{t+1} = u_t^{n_{t+1}} - \rho_t\, \mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{a}}\mathbf{u}^{\mathbf{b}}_{<t} + \sum_{(3.10)} \mu_{\boldsymbol{\alpha},\boldsymbol{\beta},\beta_+}\, \mathbf{x}^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}\, \mathbf{u}^{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{<t}\, u_t^{\beta_+}\,, \tag{3.8}$$

where $\mathbf{a} = \mathbf{a}(t+1) \in \mathbb{Z}^d_{\geq 0}$ and $\mathbf{b} = \mathbf{b}(t+1) \in \mathbb{Z}^t_{\geq 0}$ is the unique solution for

$$W_*(\, \mathbf{a},\, \mathbf{b}\,) = n_{t+1} \cdot v(t+1) \tag{3.9}$$

(note that this is a reformulation of (3.4) using $W_*(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}) = W_t(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b})$ since W_* is an extension of W_t) and the second sum ranges over those $\boldsymbol{\alpha} = \boldsymbol{\alpha}(t+2) \in \mathbb{Z}^d_{\geq 0}$ and $(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \beta_+) = \boldsymbol{\beta}(t+2) \in \mathbb{Z}^{t+1}_{\geq 0}$ which fulfill

$$\frac{W_*(\, \boldsymbol{\alpha},\, \boldsymbol{\beta}\,)}{n_{t+1} - \beta_+} >_{poly} v(t+1)$$

By using $W_*(\, \boldsymbol{\alpha},\, \boldsymbol{\beta},\, \beta_+\,) = W_*(\, \boldsymbol{\alpha},\, \boldsymbol{\beta}\,) + \beta_+ \cdot v(t+1)$ we obtain the equivalent condition

$$W_*(\, \boldsymbol{\alpha},\, \boldsymbol{\beta},\, \beta_+\,) >_{poly} n_{t+1} \cdot v(t+1) \tag{3.10}$$

Here we use the product order on $\mathbb{Q}^d_{\geq 0}$, see Notation 3.

To illustrate the construction of the invariant, let us do some examples before continuing with our results.

Example 3.6. Consider the curve determined by

$$f = \left[\, (z^7 - x^7)^2 - x^{21} - x^{18}z^3 \,\right]^2 + x^{43} \in K[[x]][z]$$

The construction tells us to start with W_0. As one computes easily, the polyhedron $\Delta^{W_0}(\, f;\, x;\, z\,) \subset \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ has the only vertex $v(1) = 1$ and

$$F_{v(1),W_0} = (Z^7 - X^7)^2.$$

Thus $u_1 := z^7 - x^7$,

$$f^{(1)} = \left[\, u_1^2 - x^{21} - x^{18}z^3 \,\right]^2 + x^{43}$$

and the extension of W_0 to $W_1 : \mathbb{Z}^2_{\geq 0} \to \mathbb{Q}_{\geq 0}$ is determined by $W_1(x) = 1, W_1(z) = 1$. (This looks familiar, see Example 2.10). The polyhedron $\Delta^{W_1}(\, f;\, x, z;\, u_1\,) \subset \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ has the single vertex $v(2) = \frac{21}{2}$ and

$$F^{(1)}_{v(2),W_1} = (U_1^2 - X^{21} - X^{18}Z^3)^2.$$

Therefore the construction sets $u_2 := u_1^2 - x^{21} - x^{18}z^3$ and $f^{(2)} = u_2^2 + x^{43}$. The linear map W_1 extend to W_2 via $W_2(u_1) = \frac{21}{2}$ and after doing the last cycle, we get that $f^{(3)} = u_3 = u_2^2 + x^{43}$ and

$$\kappa(f; x; z) = \left(\, 1;\, \frac{21}{2};\, \frac{43}{2};\, \infty \,\right).$$

The attentive reader surely recognized that $\gamma_1 := v(1) \in \mathbb{Z}$ contradicts the statement of Lemma 3.4. Thus one of the assumptions must fail – namely, the given f is not irreducible.

Example 3.7. Another interesting example concerning irreducibility is

$$f = (z^2 - x^3)^2 - x^7$$

which appeared for example in [A2]. First, $\Delta^{W_0}(\, f;\, x;\, z\,) \subset \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ has the only vertex $v(1) = \frac{3}{2}$. This is not yet a contradiction to Lemma 3.4. We have

$$F_{v(1),W_0} = (Z^2 - X^3)^2.$$

Thus $u_1 := z^2 - x^3$,

$$f^{(1)} = u_1^2 - x^7.$$

The polyhedron $\Delta^{W_1}(\, f;\, x, z;\, u_1\,) \subset \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ has the single vertex $v(2) = \frac{7}{2}$ and

$$F^{(1)}_{v(2),W_1} = U_1^2 - X^7.$$

Therefore the construction sets $u_2 := f^{(1)}$ and the construction ends:

$$\kappa(f; x; z) = \left(\frac{3}{2};\, \frac{7}{2};\, \infty\right).$$

Since $v(2) = \frac{7}{2} = 2 + \frac{3}{2} \in \mathbb{Z} + v(1) \cdot \mathbb{Z}$ Lemma 3.4 implies that f is not irreducible.

Example 3.8. Let us now give an example of an irreducible hypersurface. Consider

$$f = (z^2 - x_1x_2x_3)^3 - x_1^6x_2^7x_3^3z.$$

The polyhedron $\Delta^{W_0}(\, f;\, x;\, z\,) \subset \mathbb{R}^3_{\geq 0}$ is minimal and has only one vertex $v(1) = (\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2})$. We have

$$F_{v(1),W_0} = (Z^2 - X_1X_2X_3)^3$$

and hence put $u_1 := z^2 - x_1x_2x_3$. Then we extend W_0 to W_1 by defining $W_1(z) := (\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2})$. We have

$$f^{(1)} = u_1^3 - x_1^6x_2^7x_3^3z$$

and$\Delta^{W_1}(\, f;\, x, z;\, u_1\,) \subset \mathbb{R}^3_{\geq 0}$ has the single vertex $v(2) = (\frac{5}{2}, \frac{17}{6}, \frac{3}{2})$ and

$$F^{(1)}_{v(2),W_1} = U_1^3 - X_1^6X_2^7X_3^3Z$$

Hence $u_2 := f^{(1)}$ and the construction ends:

$$\kappa(f; x; z) = \left((\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2});\, (\frac{5}{2}, \frac{17}{6}, \frac{3}{2});\, \infty\right).$$

Example 3.9. We encourage the studious reader to apply the construction for

$$f = (z^3 - x_1^3x_2)^2 + 2(z^3 - x_1^3x_2)x_1^3x_2x_3^7z + x_1^6x_2^2x_3^{14}z^2 - x_1^{37}x_2^{11}x_3^{73}z.$$

The main results of this article are the following two characterization theorems

Theorem 3.10. *Let $f \in K[[\mathbf{x}]][z]$ be an irreducible Weierstrass polynomial of degree n.*

Then f is quasi-ordinary with respect to the chosen projection defined by $(\mathbf{x}, z)$ if and only if the last entry of $\kappa(f; \mathbf{x}; z)$ is ∞.

If the last entry of $\kappa(f;\mathbf{x};z)$ is -1, then the theorem implies that f is not quasi-ordinary with respect to the given projection determined by $(\mathbf{x},z)$. But still it is possible that there is another projection such that the given singularity is quasi-ordinary.

Example 3.11. For $f = x_1^2 + z^3 + z^2x_2$ we have $\kappa(f;\mathbf{x};z) = -1$. On the other hand, if we pick $(y_1,y_2,w) = (z,x_2,x_1)$ then we can show that $f = w^2+y_1^3+y_1^2y_2 = w^2 + y_1^2(y_1+y_2)$ is quasi-ordinary.

4. Computing roots by using overweight deformations

We begin the proof of Theorem 3.10 by showing the first implication in

Proposition 4.1. *Let $f \in K[[\mathbf{x}]][z]$ be an irreducible polynomial of degree n. Suppose the last entry of $\kappa(f;\mathbf{x};z)$ is ∞.*

Then f is quasi-ordinary with respect to the chosen projection defined by $(\mathbf{x},z)$.

The strategy of the proof is as follows: First, we analyse the data provided by the assumption that the last entry of our invariant is ∞. More precisely, we recall briefly Observation 3.5 and explain how this is connected with an overweight deformation. From this we deduce a parametrization of the singularity which then yields the basis (Theorem 4.4) for a new proof of the Abhyankar-Jung Theorem (Theorem 5.6). In the final step, we study the parametrization closely and compute the difference of two roots of f explicitly. Since the discriminant is determined by the square of these differences this implies then that f is quasi-ordinary.

As we have seen in Observation 3.5 we have constructed a linear map W_* which can be identified with a weight map

$$W := W_* : K[[x]][z,u_1,\dots,u_{g-1}] \longrightarrow \mathbb{Q}^d.$$

By (3.8), the singularity $V(f)$ can be identified with the fiber $\mathfrak{X}_1$ above $T=1$ of the map $\mathfrak{X} \longrightarrow \operatorname{Spec} K[T]$, for $\mathfrak{X} = V(F_1,\dots,F_g)$ the variety given by

$$F_t \in K[[x]][z,u_1,\dots,u_{g-1},T]\ ,\ \ t \in \{0,\dots,g-1\}\,,$$

where (using the abbreviation (3.7) and Lemma 3.4)

$$F_t = Tu_{t+1} - u_t^{n_{t+1}} + \rho_t\,\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{a}}\mathbf{u}_{<t}^{\mathbf{b}} - T\cdot\left(\sum_{(3.10)} \mu_{\boldsymbol{\alpha},\boldsymbol{\beta},\beta_+}\,\mathbf{x}^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}\,\mathbf{u}_{<t}^{\boldsymbol{\beta}}\,u_t^{\beta_+}\right), \tag{4.1}$$

where $\mathbf{a} = \mathbf{a}(t+1) \in \mathbb{Z}^d_{\geq 0}, \mathbf{b} = \mathbf{b}(t+1) \in \mathbb{Z}^t_{\geq 0}, \boldsymbol{\alpha} = \boldsymbol{\alpha}(t+2) \in \mathbb{Z}^d_{\geq 0}, (\boldsymbol{\beta},\beta_+) = \boldsymbol{\beta}(t+2) \in \mathbb{Z}^{t+1}_{\geq 0}$, and $\rho_t, \mu_{\boldsymbol{\alpha},\boldsymbol{\beta},\beta_+} \in K$. By convention, $u_g = 0$ and further we have that (using Notation 3)

$$\begin{cases} W(u_t^{n_{t+1}}) \;=\; W(\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{a}}\mathbf{u}_{<t}^{\mathbf{b}}) \;<_{poly}\; W(\mathbf{x}^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}\,\mathbf{u}_{<t}^{\boldsymbol{\beta}}\,u_t^{\beta_+})\,, \\ \qquad\qquad\quad W(u_t^{n_{t+1}}) \;<_{poly}\; W(u_{t+1}). \end{cases} \tag{4.2}$$

The first line follows by (3.9) and (3.10). The second can be deduced from the fact that $v(t+1)$ is the only vertex of $\Delta^{W_t}(\,f^{(t)};\,\mathbf{x},u_0,\dots,u_{t-1};\,u_t\,)$ (Construction 3.1).

For $t \in \{0,\dots,g-1\}$, we set

$$\gamma_{t+1} := W(u_t) = v(t+1).$$

By (3.6), W is determined by the matrix $(\,Id_d\,|\,\gamma_1\,|\,\ldots\,|\,\gamma_g\,)$. Hence (4.2) can be rewritten as

$$\left\{\begin{array}{rcccl} n_{t+1}\gamma_{t+1} & = & \mathbf{a}+\sum_{i=1}^t \mathbf{b}_i\gamma_i & <_{poly} & \boldsymbol{\alpha}+\sum_{i=1}^t \boldsymbol{\beta}_i\gamma_i+\beta_+\gamma_{t+1}\,, \\ & & n_{t+1}\gamma_{t+1} & <_{poly} & \gamma_{t+2}\,, \end{array}\right. \tag{4.3}$$

where we write $\mathbf{b}=(\mathbf{b}_1,\ldots,\mathbf{b}_t)$ and $\boldsymbol{\beta}=(\boldsymbol{\beta}_1,\ldots,\boldsymbol{\beta}_t)$. Note that actually $\mathbf{b}=\mathbf{b}(t+1)$ and $(\boldsymbol{\beta},\beta_+)=\boldsymbol{\beta}(t+2)$ but in order to avoid too complicated expressions we use these references only when they are really needed. Otherwise we suppress them.

Let $\mathfrak{X}_0$ be the special fiber which is defined by the above equations where we replace T by 0, i.e. with the notations of (4.1)

$$u_t^{n_{t+1}}-\rho_t\,\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{a}}\mathbf{u}_{<t}^{\mathbf{b}}=0\ ,\ t\in\{0,\ldots,g-1\}\,. \tag{4.4}$$

Note that $\mathfrak{X}_0$ is a toric variety. Consider the point on $\mathfrak{X}_0$ given by

$$(x_1,\ldots,x_d,z,u_1,\ldots,u_{g-1})=(1,\ldots,1,c_0,c_1,\ldots,c_{g-1});$$

By using this in (4.4), we can determine the entries $c_0,\ldots,c_{g-1}$. Namely,

$$\left\{\begin{array}{rcll} c_0 & = & \eta_1\cdot\rho_0^{\frac{1}{n_1}}\,, & \text{where } \eta_1^{n_1}=1 \\ c_t & = & \eta_t\cdot\left(\rho_t\cdot c_{<t}^{\mathbf{b}}\right)^{\frac{1}{n_t}}\,, & \text{where } \eta_t^{n_t}=1\,,\quad \text{for } t\geq 1, \end{array}\right. \tag{4.5}$$

and we abbreviate again $c_{<t}^{\mathbf{b}}=c_0^{\mathbf{b}(t+1)_1}\cdots c_{t-1}^{\mathbf{b}(t+1)_t}$, for $\mathbf{b}=\mathbf{b}(t+1)\in\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^t$.

For each root of unity η_t there are n_t choices and we get in total $n_1\cdot n_2\cdots n_g=n$ choices for $(c_0,\ldots,c_{g-1})$. Later we will see that these n choices determine the n different roots of the original quasi-ordinary hypersurface f

We can assume without loss of generality that $(1,\ldots,1,c_0,c_1,\ldots,c_{g-1})$ does not belong to the singular locus of $\mathfrak{X}_0$. Let $S=(s_1,\ldots,s_d)$ be a set of d independent variables. A parametrization of $\mathfrak{X}_0$ is then given by

$$\left\{\begin{array}{rcll} x_i & = & s_i^n\,, & i\in\{1,\ldots,d\}, \\ z & = & c_0\,S^{n\gamma_1}\,, & \\ u_t & = & c_t\,S^{n\gamma_{t+1}}\,, & t\in\{1,\ldots,g-1\}. \end{array}\right. \tag{4.6}$$

Recall that we denoted for $i\in\{1,\ldots,d\}$ by e_i be the vector in $\mathbb{R}^d$ whose $i-$th coordinate is 1 and all others are 0. Then we have

Lemma 4.2. *The germ $\mathfrak{X}_1=V(f)$ has a parametrization of the form*

$$\left\{\begin{array}{rcccl} x_i & = & s_i^n & + & \sum_{\mathbf{M}>_{poly}n\cdot e_i} X_{i,\mathbf{M}}\,S^{\mathbf{M}}\,, \quad i\in\{1,\ldots,d\}, \\ z & = & c_0\,S^{n\gamma_1} & + & \sum_{\mathbf{M}>_{poly}n\cdot\gamma_1} Z_{\mathbf{M}}\,S^{\mathbf{M}}\,, \\ u_t & = & c_t\,S^{n\gamma_{t+1}} & + & \sum_{\mathbf{M}>_{poly}n\cdot\gamma_{t+1}} U_{t,\mathbf{M}}\,S^{\mathbf{M}}\,, \quad t\in\{1,\ldots,g-1\}\,. \end{array}\right. \tag{4.7}$$

Proof. We are searching for a solution of the equations (4.1) (with $T=1$) in the power series ring

$$K[[S]]=K[[s_1,\ldots,s_d]]$$

which lifts the solution of $\mathfrak{X}_0$ given in (4.6). Let f_r, $r\in\{0,\ldots,g-1\}$, be the series obtained from F_r in (4.1) by replacing T by 1.

Let us denote by $f_r((4.7))$ the expansion which we obtain if we replace $(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u})$ (recall $u_0 := z$) by the right hand side of (4.7). This can be written as

$$f_r((4.7)) = \sum_{\mathbf{N}} f_{r,\mathbf{N}}\, S^{\mathbf{N}},$$

where $f_{r,\mathbf{N}}$ ($r \in \{0,\dots,g-1\}, \mathbf{N} \in \mathbb{Z}^d_{\geq 0}$) are polynomials in the variables $X_{i,\mathbf{M}}$ ($i \in \{1,\dots,d\}$), $Z_{\mathbf{M}}$ and $U_{t,\mathbf{M}}$ ($t \in \{0,\dots,g-1\}$) with $\mathbf{M} \in \mathbb{Z}^d_{\geq 0}$.

The weight conditions and the fact that (4.6) gives a parametrization of $\mathfrak{X}_0$ imply that $f_{r,\mathbf{N}} \equiv 0$ for all $\mathbf{N} \in \mathbb{Z}^d_{\geq 0}$ with $\mathbf{N} \not\geq_{poly} n_{r+1} n \gamma_{r+1}$ or $\mathbf{N} = n_{r+1} n \gamma_{r+1}$. (Recall Notation 3 in order to keep in mind what $\not\geq_{poly}$ means). To conclude, we need to determine $X_{i,\mathbf{M}}$, $Z_{\mathbf{M}}$ and $U_{t,\mathbf{M}}$ ($i \in \{1,\dots,d\}$, $t \in \{0,\dots,g-1\}$, $M \in \mathbb{Z}^d_{\geq 0}$) in such a way that all $f_{r,\mathbf{N}}$ are zero. But from a glimpse on the polynomials $f_{r,\mathbf{N}}$ one can see that they are linear in one of the variables (the new variable), more precisely: Let $\mathbf{N} >_{poly} n_{r+1} n \gamma_{r+1}$ and set

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{P} &:= \mathbf{N} - n_{r+1} n \gamma_{r+1} \in \mathbb{Z}^d_{\geq 0}\,, \\ \mathbf{M}(\mathbf{N}) &:= n\gamma_{r+1} + \mathbf{P} >_{poly} n\gamma_{r+1}\,. \end{aligned}$$

Then we have that

$$f_{r,\mathbf{N}} = C \cdot U_{r,\mathbf{M}(\mathbf{N})} + h, \tag{4.8}$$

where $C \in K$ is a constant and h is a polynomial that does not depend on $U_{r,\mathbf{M}(\mathbf{N})}$. (This study will be done more in detail later in Observation 4.5). Hence we can find a solution for these linear equations by giving values inductively on r to $U_{r,\mathbf{M}(\mathbf{N})}$, $r \in \{0,\dots,g-1\}$, where u_0 is z. This determines all the required coefficients $Z_{\mathbf{M}}$ for $\mathbf{M} >_{poly} n \cdot \gamma_1$ and $U_{t,\mathbf{M}}$ for $\mathbf{M} >_{poly} n \cdot \gamma_{t+1}$ and $t \in \{0,\dots,g-1\}$, whereas the coefficients $X_{i,\mathbf{M}}$ are free for $\mathbf{M} >_{poly} n \cdot e_i$ and $i \in \{1,\dots,d\}$. □

Remark 4.3. The linearity argument in the previous proof is in the same spirit as the proof of the fact that the space of wedges on a smooth variety X is a locally trivial bundle over X, see [Y].

The following result is the key ingredient for our new proof of the Abhyankar-Jung Theorem.

Theorem 4.4. *Let $f \in K[[x]][z]$ be an irreducible Weierstrass polynomial of degree n. Assume that the last entry of $\kappa(f; \mathbf{x}; z)$ is ∞.*

Then the roots of f as a polynomial in z are contained in $K[[x_1^{\frac{1}{n}}, \dots, x_d^{\frac{1}{n}}]]$.

Proof. Note that we can write $x_i = s_i^n \cdot \epsilon_i$ in the parametrization found in Lemma 4.2, where ϵ_i is a unit in $K[[S]]$, for all $i \in \{1,\dots,d\}$. Since we are in characteristic zero, we can extract a $n-$th root of ϵ_i and after a change of variables we can write $x_i = s_i^n$, $i \in \{1,\dots,d\}$. Hence $s_i = x_i^{\frac{1}{n}}$, $i \in \{1,\dots,d\}$. After replacing all s_i by $x_i^{\frac{1}{n}}$ in the expansion of z in Lemma 4.2, we obtain that f has a root in $K[[x_1^{\frac{1}{n}}, \dots, x_d^{\frac{1}{n}}]]$. But the extension of the field of fractions of $K[[x]]$ to the field of fractions of $K[[x_1^{\frac{1}{n}}, \dots, x_d^{\frac{1}{n}}]]$ is Galois and hence all the other roots are also contained in $K[[x_1^{\frac{1}{n}}, \dots, x_d^{\frac{1}{n}}]]$. □

Observation 4.5. In the previous two results we have seen that it is important to determine the coefficients $Z_{\mathbf{M}}$ if we want to study the roots of f. Let us have a look at $f_{0,\mathbf{N}}$ which is coming from

$$f_0 = u_1 - z^{n_1} + \rho_0\, \mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{a}} - \left(\sum \mu_{\boldsymbol{\alpha},\beta_+}\, \mathbf{x}^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}\, z^{\beta_+}\right),$$

where the sum ranges over those $(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \beta_+)$ such that

$$\boldsymbol{\alpha} + \beta_+\gamma_1 >_{poly} n_1\gamma_1. \tag{4.9}$$

We have seen that we can pick $x_i = s_i^n$, for all $i \in \{1, \ldots, d\}$, and by (4.7) we have to plug in

$$\begin{aligned} z &= c_0\, S^{n\gamma_1} + \textstyle\sum_{\mathbf{M}>_{poly} n\cdot\gamma_1} Z_{\mathbf{M}}\, S^{\mathbf{M}}, \\ u_1 &= c_1\, S^{n\gamma_2} + \textstyle\sum_{\mathbf{M}>_{poly} n\cdot\gamma_2} U_{1,\mathbf{M}}\, S^{\mathbf{M}}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned} f_0 = {} & (c_1\, S^{n\gamma_2} + \textstyle\sum_{\mathbf{M}>_{poly} n\cdot\gamma_2} U_{1,\mathbf{M}}\, S^{\mathbf{M}}) - (c_0\, S^{n\gamma_1} + \textstyle\sum_{\mathbf{M}>_{poly} n\cdot\gamma_1} Z_{\mathbf{M}}\, S^{\mathbf{M}})^{n_1} + \\ & + \rho_0\, S^{n\mathbf{a}} - \left(\textstyle\sum \mu_{\boldsymbol{\alpha},\beta_+}\, S^{n\boldsymbol{\alpha}}\, (c_0\, S^{n\gamma_1} + \textstyle\sum_{\mathbf{M}>_{poly} n\cdot\gamma_1} Z_{\mathbf{M}}\, S^{\mathbf{M}})^{\beta_+}\right) \\ = {} & \textstyle\sum_{\mathbf{N}} f_{0,\mathbf{N}}\, S^{\mathbf{N}}. \end{aligned}$$

We already mentioned that $f_{0,\mathbf{N}} \equiv 0$ for $\mathbf{N} \not\geq_{poly} n_1 n\gamma_1$ or $\mathbf{N} = n_1 n\gamma_1$. Therefore we only need to consider $\mathbf{N} = n_1 n\gamma_1 + \mathbf{P} >_{poly} n_1 n\gamma_1$. We set $\mathbf{M}(\mathbf{N}) := n\gamma_1 + \mathbf{P}$ and claim

$$f_{0,\mathbf{N}} = \begin{cases} -n_1 c_0^{n_1-1} Z_{\mathbf{M}(\mathbf{N})} + h_<, & \text{if } \mathbf{N} \not\geq_{poly} n\gamma_2, \\ c_1 - n_1 c_0^{n_1-1} Z_{\mathbf{M}(\mathbf{N})} + h_<, & \text{if } \mathbf{N} = n\gamma_2, \\ U_{1,\mathbf{N}} - n_1 c_0^{n_1-1} Z_{\mathbf{M}(\mathbf{N})} + h_<, & \text{if } \mathbf{N} >_{poly} n\gamma_2, \end{cases} \tag{4.10}$$

where $h_<$ is a polynomial only in variables $Z_{\mathbf{M}}$ which are already known, i.e. for which $\mathbf{M} <_{poly} \mathbf{M}(\mathbf{N})$. The only part that one might has to think about is the property on $h_<$. This can be seen with the following arguments:

- Consider the term $\binom{n_1}{j} c_0^{n_1-j}\, S^{n\gamma_1(n_1-j)} \left(\sum_{\mathbf{M}>_{poly} n\gamma_1} Z_M S^M\right)^j$, for some $j \in \{2, \ldots n_1\}$. Then for each term with non-zero coefficient the exponent of S is of the form

  $$n\gamma_1(n_1 - j) + \mathbf{M}(1) + \ldots + \mathbf{M}(j) = n\gamma_1 n_1 + \mathbf{P}(1) + \ldots + \mathbf{P}(j),$$

  where $\mathbf{M}(k) = n\gamma_1 + \mathbf{P}(k)$, $\mathbf{P}(k) >_{poly} \mathbf{0}$, for all $k \in \{1, \ldots, j\}$. This exponent coincides with $\mathbf{N} = n_1 n\gamma_1 + \mathbf{P}$ if and only if

  $$\mathbf{P} = \mathbf{P}(1) + \ldots + \mathbf{P}(j).$$

  But since all $\mathbf{P}(k)$ are non-zero this implies $\mathbf{P} >_{poly} \mathbf{P}(k)$, for all k, which on the other hand means

  $$\mathbf{M}(k) = n\gamma_1 + \mathbf{P}(k) <_{poly} n\gamma_1 + \mathbf{P} = \mathbf{M}(\mathbf{N}),$$

  for all $k \in \{1, \ldots, j\}$.
- By using (4.9) and the previous arguments one can show that we also have $\widetilde{\mathbf{M}} <_{poly} \mathbf{M}(\mathbf{N})$ for those $Z_{\widetilde{\mathbf{M}}}$ appearing in $f_{0,\mathbf{N}}$ and coming from $\sum \mu_{\boldsymbol{\alpha},\beta_+}\, \mathbf{x}^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}\, z^{\beta_+}$.

Set $C := n_1 c_0^{n_1-1}$. In fact, this is the constant C mentioned in (4.8). Since we must have $f_{0,\mathbf{N}} = 0$ for all $\mathbf{N}$ we obtain from (4.10)

$$Z_{\mathbf{M}(\mathbf{N})} = \begin{cases} C^{-1} \cdot h_{<}\,, & \text{if } \mathbf{N} \not\geq_{poly} n\gamma_2\,, \\ C^{-1} \cdot (c_1 + h_{<})\,, & \text{if } \mathbf{N} = n\gamma_2\,, \\ C^{-1} \cdot (U_{1,\mathbf{N}} + h_{<})\,, & \text{if } \mathbf{N} >_{poly} n\gamma_2\,, \end{cases}$$

Therefore we understand $Z_{\mathbf{M}(\mathbf{N})}$ quite well in the first two cases, whereas we have to determine $U_{1,\mathbf{N}}$ for the last one. Before we come to this let us mention that $\mathbf{N} = n\gamma_2$ is equivalent to

$$\mathbf{M}(\mathbf{N}) = n\gamma_1 + (n\gamma_2 - n_1 n\gamma_1) = n(\gamma_2 - n_1\gamma_1 + \lambda_1) = n\lambda_2,$$

where we use $\lambda_1 := \gamma_1$ and $\lambda_2 := \gamma_2 - n_1\gamma_1 + \lambda_1$. (Compare the last definitions with (1.1)).

In general, one can show with the same arguments that, for $r \geq 1$,

$$f_{r,\mathbf{N}} = \begin{cases} -n_{r+1} c_r^{n_{r+1}-1} U_{r,\mathbf{M}(\mathbf{N})} + h_{<}\,, & \text{if } \mathbf{N} \not\geq_{poly} n\gamma_{r+2}\,, \\ c_{r+1} - n_{r+1} c_r^{n_{r+1}-1} U_{r,\mathbf{M}(\mathbf{N})} + h_{<}\,, & \text{if } \mathbf{N} = n\gamma_{r+2}\,, \\ U_{r+1,\mathbf{N}} - n_{r+1} c_r^{n_{r+1}-1} U_{r,\mathbf{M}(\mathbf{N})} + h_{<}\,, & \text{if } \mathbf{N} >_{poly} n\gamma_{r+2}\,, \end{cases}$$

where $h_{<}$ is a polynomial in variables that are already known. Moreover, $\mathbf{N} = n\gamma_{r+2}$ is equivalent to

$$\mathbf{M}(\mathbf{N}) = n\lambda_{r+2},$$

where $\lambda_{r+2} := \gamma_{r+2} - n_{r+1}\gamma_{r+1} + \lambda_{r+1}$.

As conclusion we get that

$$z = c_0\, S^{n\lambda_1} + \sum(c_0) + \sum_{r=1}^{g-1} \Big(d_r(c_0, \ldots, c_r)\, S^{n\lambda_{r+1}} + \sum(c_0, \ldots, c_r) \Big)\,, \tag{4.11}$$

where

(1) $d_r(c_0, \ldots, c_r)$ is a polynomial in $(c_0, \ldots, c_r)$ which is linear in c_r and

(2) $\sum(c_0) := \sum Z_{\mathbf{M}}(c_0)\, S^{\mathbf{M}}$ (resp. $\sum(c_0, \ldots, c_r) = (\sum Z_{\mathbf{M}}(c_0, \ldots, c_r)\, S^{\mathbf{M}})$) is an abbreviation for the intermediate terms whose coefficients do only depend on c_0 (resp. $(c_0, \ldots, c_r)$). By this we mean those $\mathbf{M}$ with $\mathbf{M} >_{poly} n\lambda_1$, but $\mathbf{M} \not\geq n\lambda_2$ (resp. with $\mathbf{M} >_{poly} n\lambda_{r+1}$, but $\mathbf{M} \not\geq n\lambda_{r+2}$).

Finally, we have determined all the coefficients $Z_{\mathbf{M}}$ of the parametrization of z. If we replace now each s_i by $x_i^{\frac{1}{n}}$, $i \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$, then we obtain the different roots of f. (Keep in mind that the different choices for $(c_0, c_1, \ldots, c_{g-1})$ determine all the roots of f).

Now, we can come to the

Proof of Proposition 4.1. We want to prove that $f \in K[[\mathbf{x}]][z]$ is quasi-ordinary. By the assumption that our invariant ends with ∞ we obtained an overweight deformation from which we constructed the roots in the previous parts. It remains to show that the difference of the different roots are monomials times a unit.

By (4.5), a root ζ is determined by the choice of certain roots of unity $(\eta_1, \ldots, \eta_g)$ which determine the values $(c_0, \ldots, c_{g-1})$. Let ζ_1, ζ_2 be two roots of f and let

$(\eta_1^{(1)},\dots,\eta_g^{(1)})$ resp. $(\eta_1^{(2)},\dots,\eta_g^{(2)})$ be the corresponding roots of unity. If $\eta_1^{(1)} \neq \eta_1^{(2)}$ then it follows from (4.5) and (4.11) that

$$\zeta_1 - \zeta_2 = x^{\lambda_1} \cdot \epsilon_1,$$

for a unit ϵ_1. Note that ϵ_1 corresponds to a unit in $K[[S]]$. (Recall that we have to replace s_i by $x_i^{\frac{1}{n}}$ for all i).

Therefore suppose $\eta_j^{(1)} = \eta_j^{(2)}$, for all $j \in \{1,\dots,r-1\}$, and $\eta_r^{(1)} \neq \eta_r^{(2)}$, for some $r \geq 1$. Since all the terms in (4.11) before $S^{n\lambda_r}$ do only depend on $c_0,\dots,c_{r-1}$ (which coincide for both roots by the assumption on the roots of unity and (4.5)) these must vanish in $\zeta_1 - \zeta_2$. Moreover, since $d_r(c_0,\dots,c_r)$ is linear in c_r we get

$$\zeta_1 - \zeta_2 = x^{\lambda_r} \cdot \epsilon_r,$$

for some unit ϵ_r as before. This implies the assertion of the proposition. □

5. The other direction

In Proposition 4.1 we showed that if the last entry of our invariant is ∞ then the considered singularity is quasi-ordinary. For a full characterization it remains to prove

Proposition 5.1. *Let $f \in K[[\mathbf{x}]][z]$ be an irreducible polynomial of degree n. Suppose the last entry of $\kappa(f;\mathbf{x};z)$ is -1.*

Then f is not quasi-ordinary with respect to the chosen projection defined by $(\mathbf{x},z)$.

By the assumption the last entry of the invariant is -1. If we have a look in Construction 3.1 then we see that the last considered polyhedron, say

$$\Delta_g := \Delta^{W_g}(\, f^{(g)};\, \mathbf{x}, u_0,\dots,u_{g-1};\, u_g\,) \subset \mathbb{R}^d_{\geq 0},$$

for some $g \geq 0$, has more than one vertex although u_g is chosen in such a way that Δ_g is minimal. Recall that the linear map W_g is determined by the matrix

$$W_g = (\, Id_d \,|\, v(1) \,|\, v(2) \,|\, \cdots \,|\, v(g)\,).$$

Moreover, we have $f^{(g)} \in K[[\mathbf{x}]][u_0]_{<n_1}[u_1]_{<n_2}\cdots[u_{g-1}]_{<n_g}[u_g]$ and we constructed, for $0 \leq t \leq g-1$,

$$u_{t+1} = u_t^{n_{t+1}} - \rho_t\, \mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{a}} \mathbf{u}_{<t}^{\mathbf{b}} + \sum_{(3.10)} \mu_{\boldsymbol{\alpha},\boldsymbol{\beta},\beta_+}\, \mathbf{x}^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}\, \mathbf{u}_{<t}^{\boldsymbol{\beta}}\, u_t^{\beta_+}\,. \tag{5.1}$$

Now, we extend Construction 3.1 by

Construction 5.2. Recall that $f^{(g)}$ is a polynomial of degree $e_g = \frac{n}{n_1\cdots n_g}$ in u_g. We have that $\Delta_g = \Delta^{W_g}(\, f^{(g)};\, \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}_{<g};\, u_g\,)$ has more than one vertex. Let $\mathfrak{v}$ be the minimal vertex of Δ_g with respect to the lexicographical order. Then we define

$$\widetilde{u_{g+1}} := u_g^{e_g} + \underbrace{\sum_{\frac{W_g(\mathbf{a},\mathbf{b})}{e_g - c} = \mathfrak{v}} \rho_{\mathbf{a},\mathbf{b},c}\, \mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{a}}\, \mathbf{u}_{<g}^{\mathbf{b}}\, u_g^c}_{=:\widetilde{h_0}} + \underbrace{\sum_{\frac{W_g(\boldsymbol{\alpha},\boldsymbol{\beta})}{e_g - \delta} >_{poly} \mathfrak{v}} \mu_{\boldsymbol{\alpha},\boldsymbol{\beta},\delta}\, \mathbf{x}^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}\, \mathbf{u}_{<g}^{\boldsymbol{\beta}}\, u_g^{\delta}}_{=:\widetilde{h_+}}, \tag{5.2}$$

where $\rho_{\mathbf{a},\mathbf{b},c} \in K$, not all $\rho_{\mathbf{a},\mathbf{b},c}$ are zero, and $\mu_{\boldsymbol{\alpha},\boldsymbol{\beta},\delta} \in K$. Here, $\min\{c \mid \rho_{\mathbf{a},\mathbf{b},c} \neq 0\}$ is not necessarily zero. Let $u_{g+1} \in K[[\mathbf{x}]][u_0]_{<n_1}[u_1]_{<n_2} \cdots [u_{g-1}]_{<n_g}[u_g]$ be the reduction of $\widetilde{u_{g+1}}$, i.e. $\widetilde{u_{g+1}} = u_{g+1}^{e_{g+1}}$, for $e_{g+1} \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ maximal with this property. Then u_{g+1} is of the same shape as (5.2),

$$u_{g+1} = u_g^{n_{g+1}} + h_0 + h_+ \,, \tag{5.3}$$

where $n_{g+1} = \frac{e_g}{e_{g+1}}$ and h_0 is the sum over those monomials which correspond to $\mathfrak{v}$ in Δ_g and h_+ is the sum over the monomials which yield points $\mathfrak{w} \in \Delta_g$ for which $\mathfrak{w} >_{poly} \mathfrak{v}$. Note that h_0 could consist of more than one term.

In order to get later an overweight deformation, we have to modify W_g such that every monomial appearing in $f^{(g)}$ whose associated point in the polyhedron is not $\mathfrak{v}$ has strictly bigger weight. Thus at the beginning of the construction we replace $W_0 = Id_d$ by the linear map $W_C : \mathbb{Z}^d_{\geq 0} \to \mathbb{Q}^d_{\geq 0}$ with matrix

$$W_C := \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & \cdots & 0 \\ C_1^{(2)} & 1 & 0 & \cdots & \cdots & 0 \\ C_1^{(3)} & C_2^{(3)} & 1 & \ddots & & \vdots \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \vdots & \vdots & & \ddots & \ddots & 0 \\ C_1^{(d)} & C_2^{(d)} & \cdots & \cdots & C_{d-1}^{(d)} & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \tag{5.4}$$

where we pick the coefficients $C_i^{(j)} \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ of W_C in such a way that we get for every $\mathfrak{w} \in \Delta_g \setminus \{\mathfrak{v}\}$

$$W_C(\mathfrak{w}) >_{poly} W_C(\mathfrak{v}). \tag{5.5}$$

In particular, $W_C(\Delta_g)$ has exactly one vertex, namely

$$\mathfrak{v}_C := \mathfrak{v}_C(g+1) := W_C(\mathfrak{v}).$$

To be consistent, we have to start Construction 3.1 again from the very beginning, but now we replace Id_d by W_C. Since W_C is a linear map, the first polyhedra still have exactly one vertex; more precisely, for $1 \leq t \leq g$, the vertices are

$$v_C(t) := W_C(v(t)),$$

and further the equations (5.1) are the same as before. Note that we are not using W_g but

$$W_{C,g} = (\, W_C \,|\, v_C(1) \,|\, v_C(2) \,|\, \cdots \,|\, v_C(g) \,) = W_C \cdot W_g.$$

As already mentioned

$$\Delta_{C,g} := W_C(\Delta_g) = \Delta^{W_{C,g}}(\, f^{(g)};\, \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}_{<g};\, u_g \,) \subset \mathbb{R}^d_{\geq 0},$$

has only the vertex $\mathfrak{v}_C$.

We extend $W_{C,g}$ (on $K[[\mathbf{x}]][\mathbf{u}_{<g}]$) to a linear map $W_{C,g+1} : \mathbb{Z}^{d+g+1}_{\geq 0} \to \mathbb{Q}^d_{\geq 0}$ (on $K[[\mathbf{x}]][\mathbf{u}_{<g}][u_g]$) by assigning

$$W_{C,g+1}(u_g) := \mathfrak{v}_C(g+1)\,.$$

Let us point out that we use (5.3) without doing further modifications. In the next step, we consider $f^{(g)}$ as an element in $K[[\mathbf{x}]][u_0]_{<n_1}[u_1]_{<n_2} \cdots [u_g]_{<n_{g+1}}[u_{g+1}]$ by using (5.3) and we call the obtained element $f^{(g+1)}$. By the assumption, there

exists at least one point $\mathfrak{w} \in \Delta_g$ determined by some monomial in $f^{(g)}$ and for which $\mathfrak{w} \not\geq_{poly} \mathfrak{v}$. Hence $f^{(g+1)} \neq u_{g+1}^{e_{g+1}}$.

We fix u_{g+1}, i.e. we do **not** perform any changes in u_{g+1} to minimize

$$\Delta_{C,g+1} := \Delta^{W_{C,g+1}}(f^{(g+1)}; \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}_{\leq g}; u_{g+1}).$$

Therefore we also do not modify (5.3). Let $\mathfrak{u}$ be the minimal vertex of $\Delta_{C,g+1}$ with respect to the lexicographical order.

It is worth to mention that $\mathfrak{u}$ possibly corresponds to a point in the interior of Δ_g and thus is not necessarily a vertex there: for example, consider the polynomial $f = z^3+x_1^5+x_1^4x_2+x_2^5+x_1^2x_2^4$, then for $\Delta^{W_0}(f; \mathbf{x}; z)$ we get the vertices $\mathfrak{v} = (0, \frac{5}{3})$ and $(\frac{5}{3}, 0)$, but $(\frac{2}{5}, \frac{4}{5})$ corresponds to the point $\mathfrak{u}$.

If $\mathfrak{u}$ is the only vertex of $\Delta_{C,g+1}$ then we extend $W_{C,g+1}$ to a linear map $W_{C,g+2}$ by putting

$$W_{C,g+2}(u_{g+1}) := \mathfrak{u}$$

and further we define

$$u_{g+2} := u_{g+1}^{e_{g+1}} + h_0^{(1)} + h_+^{(1)},$$

where we set

$$\begin{aligned} h_0^{(1)} &:= \sum_{\frac{W_{C,g+1}(\mathbf{a},\mathbf{b})}{e_{g+1}-c}=\mathfrak{u}} \rho_{g+1,c}\, \mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{a}}\, \mathbf{u}_{<g+1}^{\mathbf{b}}\, u_{g+1}^{c}\,, \\ h_+^{(1)} &:= \sum_{\frac{W_{C,g+1}(\boldsymbol{\alpha},\boldsymbol{\beta})}{e_{g+1}-\delta}>_{poly}\mathfrak{u}} \mu_{\boldsymbol{\alpha},\boldsymbol{\beta},\delta}\, \mathbf{x}^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}\, \mathbf{u}_{<g+1}^{\boldsymbol{\beta}}\, u_{g+1}^{\delta}\,. \end{aligned}$$

Thus $f^{(g+1)} = u_{g+2}$ and the construction ends in this case.

Hence suppose $\Delta_{C,g+1}$ has more than one vertex. Similar to before, we replace W_C by another linear map $W_D : \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^d \to \mathbb{Q}_{\geq 0}^d$ with matrix

$$W_D := \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & \cdots & 0 \\ D_1^{(2)} & 1 & 0 & \cdots & \cdots & 0 \\ D_1^{(3)} & D_2^{(3)} & 1 & \ddots & & \vdots \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \vdots & \vdots & & \ddots & \ddots & 0 \\ D_1^{(d)} & D_2^{(d)} & \cdots & \cdots & D_{d-1}^{(d)} & 1 \end{pmatrix},$$

where we pick the coefficients $D_i^{(j)} \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ of W_D in such a way that we get for every $\mathfrak{w} \in \Delta_{C,g+1} \setminus \{\mathfrak{u}\}$

$$W_D(\mathfrak{w}) >_{poly} W_D(\mathfrak{u}).$$

In particular, $W_D(\Delta_{g+1})$ has exactly one vertex, namely

$$\mathfrak{u}_D := W_D(\mathfrak{u}).$$

In fact, $W_D = W_{\widetilde{D}} \cdot W_C$, where we pick $W_{\widetilde{D}}$ similar to (5.4) by assuming that we started with Id_d and not W_C. This implies that the condition (5.5) is stable under the change to W_D.

Again, in order to be consistent, we start Construction 3.1 from the very beginning, but now we replace W_C by W_D. Since W_D is a linear map, the first polyhedra still have exactly one vertex; more precisely, for $1 \leq t \leq g$, the vertices are

$$v_D(t) := W_D(v(t)),$$

and $W_D(\Delta_g)$ has the only vertex $\mathfrak{v}_D := \mathfrak{v}_D(g+1) := W_D(\mathfrak{v})$. Further, the equations (5.1) and (5.3) are still the same as before. Note that we are now using

$$W_{D,g+1} = (\, W_D \,|\, v_D(1) \,|\, v_D(2) \,|\, \cdots \,|\, v_D(g) \,|\, \mathfrak{v}_D \,)$$

in the weight conditions. As already mentioned

$$\Delta_{D,g+1} := W_{\widetilde{D}}(\Delta_{C,g+1}) = \Delta^{W_{D,g+1}}(\, f^{(g+1)};\, \mathbf{x}, u_0, \ldots, u_g;\, u_{g+1}\,) \subset \mathbb{R}^d_{\geq 0},$$

has exactly one vertex, $\mathfrak{u}_D = W_D(\mathfrak{u})$. Thus we extend $W_{D,g+1}$ to a linear map $W_{D,g+2}$ by setting

$$W_{D,g+2}(u_{g+1}) := \mathfrak{u}_D$$

and we define

$$u_{g+2} \;:=\; u_{g+1}^{e_{g+1}} + h_0^{(1)} + h_+^{(1)}, \tag{5.6}$$

where we set

$$\begin{aligned} h_0^{(1)} \;&:=\; \sum_{\frac{W_{D,g+1}(\mathbf{a},\mathbf{b})}{e_{g+1}-c} = \mathfrak{u}_D} \rho_{g+1,c}\, \mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{a}}\, \mathbf{u}^{\mathbf{b}}_{<g+1}\, u_{g+1}^{c}\,, \\ h_+^{(1)} \;&:=\; \sum_{\frac{W_{D,g+1}(\boldsymbol{\alpha},\boldsymbol{\beta})}{e_{g+1}-\delta} >_{poly} \mathfrak{u}_D} \mu_{\boldsymbol{\alpha},\boldsymbol{\beta},\delta}\, \mathbf{x}^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}\, \mathbf{u}^{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{<g+1}\, u_{g+1}^{\delta}\,. \end{aligned}$$

Thus $f^{(g+1)} = u_{g+2}$ and the construction ends.

Essentially, the remaining part for the proof of Proposition 5.1 is to go very carefully through the previous section: First, one has to show Lemma 4.2 to obtain the analogue of (4.7) in the modified setting. Then one has to study precisely the coefficients in order to compute the roots as in Observation 4.5. Finally, by applying the inverse of W_C one gets back to the original setting and obtains the roots. One can show that for at least two of them the difference is not a monomial times a unit which in turn implies the same for the discriminant and thus f is not quasi-ordinary with respect to the given projection.

Before we continue, let us study the change from Id_d to W_C a little bit more:

Observation 5.3. We have

$$W_C = (\, C_1 \,|\, C_2 \,|\, \cdots \,|\, C_d\,) = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & \cdots & 0 \\ C_1^{(2)} & 1 & 0 & \cdots & \cdots & 0 \\ C_1^{(3)} & C_2^{(3)} & 1 & \ddots & & \vdots \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \vdots & \vdots & & \ddots & \ddots & 0 \\ C_1^{(d)} & C_2^{(d)} & \cdots & \cdots & C_{d-1}^{(d)} & 1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Therefore $C_i = e_i + C_{>i}$, where we put $C_{>i} := \sum_{j>i} C_i^{(j)} \cdot e_j$, for all $i \in \{1, \ldots, d\}$.

First, the inverse W_C^{-1} is of the same shape (5.4), we only have to admit that there might appear negative coefficients.

If we apply the definition of W_C on the unit vectors (resp. x_i, for $1 \leq i \leq d$) then we get

$$\begin{aligned} W_C(x_1) &= W_0(x_1) + C_1^{(2)} \cdot W_0(x_2) + \ldots + C_1^{(d)} \cdot W_0(x_d)\,, \\ &\vdots \\ W_C(x_i) &= W_0(x_i) + C_i^{(i+1)} \cdot W_0(x_{i+1}) + \ldots + C_i^{(d)} \cdot W_0(x_d)\,, \\ &\vdots \\ W_C(x_d) &= W_0(x_d)\,. \end{aligned}$$

We can reinterpret this as the monomial map

$$\begin{aligned} K[[\mathbf{x}]] = K[[x_1, \ldots, x_d]] &\to K[[\mathbf{y}]] = K[[y_1, \ldots, y_d]]\,, \\ x_1 &\mapsto y_1 \cdot y_2^{C_1^{(2)}} \cdots y_d^{C_1^{(d)}}\,, \\ &\vdots \\ x_i &\mapsto y_i \cdot y_{i+1}^{C_i^{(i+1)}} \cdots y_d^{C_i^{(d)}}\,, \\ &\vdots \\ x_{d-1} &\mapsto y_{d-1} \cdot y_d^{C_{d-1}^{(d)}}\,, \\ x_d &\mapsto y_d\,, \end{aligned}$$

under which $f^{(g+1)}$ has the desired nice shape. Nevertheless, we can get back via the inverse W_C^{-1} by going from the bottom to the top in the previous map and additionally admitting negative exponents:

$$\left\{ \begin{aligned} y_d &\mapsto x_d\,, \\ y_{d-1} &\mapsto x_{d-1} \cdot x_d^{-C_{d-1}^{(d)}}\,, \\ y_{d-2} &\mapsto x_{d-2} \cdot \left(x_{d-1} \cdot x_d^{-C_{d-1}^{(d)}} \right)^{-C_{d-2}^{(d-1)}} x_d^{-C_{d-2}^{(d)}}\,, \\ &\vdots \\ y_1 &\mapsto x_1 \cdot \big(y_2(x_2, \ldots, x_d) \big)^{-C_1^{(2)}} \cdots \big(y_{d-1}(x_{d-1}, x_d) \big)^{-C_1^{(d-1)}} x_d^{-C_1^{(d)}}\,. \end{aligned} \right. \tag{5.7}$$

Note that the inverse is defined on the open set where $x_2 \cdots x_d \neq 0$. Hence the map is birational.

Before giving the proof of Proposition 5.1, let us do two examples in order to make the reader more familiar with Construction 5.2 and the ideas of the proof. Here and in the following we use the notations of the previous section.

Example 5.4. Let $f = z^2 - x_1^2 - x_2^3 \in K[[x_1, x_2]][z]$. The associated polyhedron has two vertices $(0, \frac{3}{2})$ and $(1, 0)$. The lexicographical minimum is $\mathfrak{v} = (0, \frac{3}{2})$. Hence we put as in (5.3)

$$u_1 := z^2 - x_2^3$$

and get $f^{(1)} = u_2 := u_1 - x_1^2$. At this point we obtained

$$\left\{ \begin{aligned} Tu_1 - (z^2 - x_2^3) &= 0 \\ (u_1 - x_1^2) &= 0\,. \end{aligned} \right. \tag{5.8}$$

But this is not an overweight deformation with respect to W_0 since

$$W_0(x_1^2) = (2,0) \not>_{poly} (0,3) = W_0(x_2^3)\,.$$

One possible choice for W_C is $\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 2 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$, i.e. $W_C(x_1) = (1,2)$ and therefore we get $W_C(x_1^2) = (2,4) >_{poly} (0,3) = W_C(x_2^3)$.

At the fiber $T = 0$ we get a toric variety which yields together with W_C:

$$\begin{array}{rcll} x_1 & = & s_1^2 s_2^4 & = S^{n\cdot W_C(x_1)}\,, \\ x_2 & = & s_2^2\,, & \\ z & = & c_0 \cdot s_2^3 & = c_0 \cdot S^{n\gamma_1} = c_0 \cdot S^{n\cdot W_C(z)}\,, \\ u_1 & = & s_1^4 s_2^8 & = x_1^2\,, \end{array}$$

where $c_0^2 = 1$, i.e. $c_0 \in \{-1, +1\}$.

Since (5.8) is an overweight deformation the arguments of the previous section apply and we get for f (i.e. $T = 1$):

$$\begin{array}{rcl} x_1 & = & s_1^2 s_2^4\,, \\ x_2 & = & s_2^2\,, \\ z & = & c_0 \cdot s_2^3 + \sum_{\mathbf{M} >_{poly} (0,3)} Z_{\mathbf{M}}\, S^{\mathbf{M}}\,, \\ u_1 & = & s_1^4 s_2^8\,, \end{array} \tag{5.9}$$

If we plug this in $f = z^2 - x_1^2 - x_2^3$, then we obtain $Z_{\mathbf{M}} \equiv 0$ for $\mathbf{M} \not\geq_{poly} (4,5)$ and $Z_{(4,5)} = \frac{1}{2c_0}$. One might even compute the higher coefficients, but for our purpose those two are enough and we write for the higher terms only H. Then we have

$$z(c_0) = c_0\, s_2^3 + \frac{1}{2c_0} s_1^4 s_2^5 + H$$

and for the two choices of c_0, we obtain the difference

$$z(1) - z(-1) = 2s_2^3 + s_1^4 s_2^5 + H_*$$

and its square is

$$(2s_2^3 + s_1^4 s_2^5 + H_*) = 4s_2^6 + 4s_1^4 s_2^8 + \widetilde{H_*}.$$

In order to obtain from this the square of the difference of the roots, we have to switch from the coordinates (s_1, s_2) to (x_1, x_2) by using (5.9). This yields

$$(\zeta_1 - \zeta_2)^2 = 4x_2^3 + 4x_1^2 + \widetilde{h_*}\,,$$

where ζ_1, ζ_2 denotes the two different roots of f. Since this is not a monomial times a unit, f is not quasi-ordinary with respect to the projection given by $(\mathbf{x}; z)$. (In fact, one can show $\widetilde{h_*} \equiv 0$).

As indicated in Observation 5.3 we could alternatively consider the image of f under the monomial map $(\,x_1,\, x_2\,) \mapsto (\,y_1 y_2^2,\, y_2\,)$ and obtain $f_y := z^2 - y_1^2 y_2^4 - y_2^3$ and continue in this direction.

Let us now consider an example that is a little bit more delicate:

Example 5.5. Let $f = (z^2 - x_1^3 - x_2^2)^2 - x_1^5 x_2$. The polyhedron $\Delta^{W_0}(\,f;\, \mathbf{x};\, z\,)$ is generated by the points $(\frac{3}{2}, 0)$, $\mathfrak{v} := (0,1)$ and $(\frac{5}{4}, \frac{1}{4})$.

For $W_C = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$ (i.e. $W_C(e_1) = (1,1)$ and $W_C(e_2) = (0,1)$) we get

$$W_C(\tfrac{3}{2}, 0) = (\tfrac{3}{2}, \tfrac{3}{2}) \quad >_{poly} \quad W_C(\tfrac{5}{4}, \tfrac{1}{4}) = (\tfrac{5}{4}, \tfrac{3}{2}) \quad >_{poly} \quad W_C(0,1) = (0,1)$$

Then we get $u_1 := z^2 - x_2^2$ and $f^{(1)} = (u_1 - x_1^3)^2 - x_1^5 x_2$. We extend W_C to $W_{C,1}$ by putting $W_{C,1}(z) := \mathfrak{v} = (0,1)$.

The polyhedron $\Delta^{W_{C,1}}(\, f^{(1)};\, \mathbf{x}, z;\, u_1\,)$ is generated by $(3,3)$ and $\mathfrak{u} := (\frac{5}{2}, 3)$ and hence has exactly one vertex. We extend $W_{C,2}(u_1) := \mathfrak{u} = (\frac{5}{2}, 3)$ and define $u_2 := f^{(1)}$. Thus Construction 5.2 ends and we have achieved the following overweight deformation with respect to $W_{C,2}$

$$\begin{aligned} F_1 &:= Tu_1 - (z^2 - x_2^2) &&= 0\,,\\ F_2 &:= Tu_2 - (u_1^2 - x_1^5 x_2) + T(x^6 - 2u_1 x_1^3) &&= 0\,. \end{aligned}$$

Using the arguments of the previous section we get at the fiber $T = 0$:

$$\left\{\begin{array}{rcccccl} x_1 &=& S^{4\cdot W_{C,3}(x_1)} & & & = & s_1^4 s_2^4\,,\\ x_2 &=& S^{4\cdot W_{C,3}(x_2)} & & & = & s_2^4\,,\\ z &=& c_0 S^{4\cdot W_{C,3}(z)} &=& c_0 S^{4\cdot \mathfrak{v}} & = & c_0\, s_2^4\,,\\ u_1 &=& c_1 S^{4\cdot W_{C,3}(u_1)} &=& c_1 S^{4\cdot \mathfrak{u}} & = & c_1\, s_1^{10} s_2^{12}\,. \end{array}\right. \tag{5.10}$$

with $c_0^2 = c_1^2 = 1$. Again, one can show that the fiber $T = 1$ is determined by an overweight deformation of (5.10). In particular,

$$\begin{aligned} x_1 &= s_1^4 s_2^4\,,\\ x_2 &= s_2^4\,,\\ z &= c_0\, s_2^4 + \textstyle\sum_{\mathbf{M} >_{poly} (0,4)} Z_{\mathbf{M}}\, S^{\mathbf{M}}\,,\\ u_1 &= c_1\, s_1^{10} s_2^{12} + \textstyle\sum_{\mathbf{M} >_{poly} (10,12)} U_{1,\mathbf{M}}\, S^{\mathbf{M}}\,. \end{aligned}$$

If we plug this into $F_1 = 0$ (for $T = 1$) then we obtain $Z_{\mathbf{M}} \equiv 0$ for $\mathbf{M} >_{poly} (0,4)$ and $\mathbf{M} \not\leq_{poly} (10,8)$, whereas $Z_{(10,8)} = \frac{c_1}{2c_0}$. Therefore $z = c_0 s_2^4 + \frac{c_1}{2c_0} s_1^{10} s_2^8 + H$, where we abbreviate H for some higher order terms.

Now, it is straightforward as in Example 5.4. Compute the difference for two different choices of $c_0, c_1 \in \{-1, 1\}$ and deduce with (5.10) that the discriminant can not be a monomial. (Use that $s_1^{10} s_2^{12} = x_1^{\frac{5}{2}} x_2^{\frac{1}{2}}$).

Finally, we come now to

Proof of Proposition 5.1. Construction 3.1 and Construction 5.2 yield the vertices

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_{t,D} &:= v_D(t)\,, \quad \text{for } 1 \leq t \leq g\,,\\ \gamma_{g+1,D} &:= \mathfrak{v}_D\,,\\ \gamma_{g+2,D} &:= \mathfrak{u}_D\,. \end{aligned}$$

If we translate these back to the original situation (via the inverse of W_D) then we obtain $v(1), v(2), \ldots, v(g), \mathfrak{v}, \mathfrak{u}\,.$

By (5.1) and (5.3) and (5.6), we have an overweight deformation as in (4.1):

$$\left\{\begin{array}{ll} F_t &= Tu_{t+1} - u_t^{n_{t+1}} + \rho_t\, \mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{a}} \mathbf{u}_{<t}^{\mathbf{b}} - T \cdot \left(\displaystyle\sum_{(3.10)} \mu_{\boldsymbol{\alpha},\boldsymbol{\beta},\beta_+} \mathbf{x}^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}} \mathbf{u}_{<t}^{\boldsymbol{\beta}} u_t^{\beta_+} \right),\\ & \qquad \text{for } t \in \{0, \ldots, g-1\}\,,\\ F_g &= Tu_{g+1} - u_g^{n_{g+1}} - h_0 - T \cdot h_+\\ F_{g+1} &= Tu_{g+2} - u_{g+1}^{e_{g+1}} - h_0^{(1)} - T \cdot h_+^{(1)}\,, \end{array}\right. \tag{5.11}$$

Note that we have $u_{g+2} = 0$. Here, we mean by (3.10) the corresponding modified variant using $W_{D,g+2}$. Moreover, the conditions (4.2) resp. (4.3) are true in the modified version.

Again, (5.11) defines a variety $\mathfrak{X} \to \mathrm{Spec}(K[T])$ and similar to (4.6) we get at the fiber $T = 0$

$$\begin{array}{rcll} x_i & = & S^{nD_i}\,, & i \in \{1,\ldots,d\}, \\ u_{t-1} & = & c_{t-1}S^{n\gamma_{t,D}}\,, & t \in \{1,\ldots,g+2\} \end{array}$$

for certain $c_0, c_1, \ldots, c_{g+1} \in K$. Recall that $u_0 = z$ and that the D_i are coming from W_D, (5.4). Note that the fiber $T = 0$ is not necessarily a toric variety because h_0 and $h_0^{(1)}$ may consists of more than one monomial (e.g. $f = z^3 + x_2^4 z + x_2^6 - x_1^7$). But this does not have any effects on our approach and since K is algebraically closed we can still determine the coefficients c_g and c_{g+1}.

With the same proof as in Lemma 4.2 we deduce from this for the fiber $T = 1$, $\mathfrak{X}_1$ (which is the original variety):

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{rcccl} x_i & = & S^{nD_i} & + & \sum_{\mathbf{M} >_{poly} nD_i} X_{i,\mathbf{M}}\, S^{\mathbf{M}} \\ u_{t-1} & = & c_{t-1}S^{n\gamma_{t,D}} & + & \sum_{\mathbf{M} >_{poly} n\gamma_{t,D}} U_{t-1,\mathbf{M}}\, S^{\mathbf{M}} \end{array} \right. \tag{5.12}$$

where $i \in \{1,\ldots,d\}$ and $t \in \{1,\ldots,g+2\}$.

By (5.4) $D_i = e_i + \sum_{j>i} D_i^{(j)}$ and therefore $x_i = S^{D_{>i}} s_1^n \cdot \epsilon_i$, where ϵ_i is a unit and we put $D_{>i} := \sum_{j>i} D_i^{(j)}$, for all $i \in \{1,\ldots,d\}$. Since s_i is not appearing in $S^{D_{>i}}$ and since we can extract an n–th root of ϵ_i (characteristic zero), we can change s_i such that we get $x_i = S^{nD_i}$, for all $i \in \{1,\ldots,d\}$. Note that $x_d = s_d^n$.

With the same arguments as in Observation 4.5 we can compute the coefficients in (5.12) for $\mathfrak{X}_1$ and obtain (as in (4.11))

$$z = c_0\, S^{n\lambda_{1,D}} + \sum(c_0) + \sum_{r=1}^{g+1} \Big(d_r(c_0,\ldots,c_r)\, S^{n\lambda_{r+1,D}} + \sum(c_0,\ldots,c_r) \Big)\,,$$

where $\lambda_{r+1,D} = \gamma_{r+1,D} - n_r\gamma_{r,D} + \lambda_{r,D}$, $r \in \{0,\ldots,g+1\}$, and

(1) $d_r(c_0,\ldots,c_r)$ is a polynomial in $(c_0,\ldots,c_r)$ which is linear in c_r and

(2) $\sum(c_0) := \sum Z_{\mathbf{M}}(c_0)\, S^{\mathbf{M}}$ (resp. $\sum(c_0,\ldots,c_r) = (\sum Z_{\mathbf{M}}(c_0,\ldots,c_r)\, S^{\mathbf{M}})$) is an abbreviation for the intermediate terms whose coefficients do only depend on c_0 (resp. $(c_0,\ldots,c_r)$).

Using $x_i = S^{nD_i}$, for $i \in \{d, d-1, \ldots, 1\}$, (resp. using $s_i = y_i^{\frac{1}{n}}$ and the inverse of W_D, see (5.7)), we replace the s_i and obtain the n different roots of f, which correspond to the different choices for the values of $(c_0,\ldots,c_{g+1})$.

Although $\lambda_{r,D} <_{poly} \lambda_{r+1,D}$, for all $r \in \{1,\ldots,g+1\}$, this is not true for all of them after we applied the inverse of W_D. Hence there exist at least two different roots (which are connected to $\mathfrak{v}$ and $\mathfrak{u}$) such that their difference is not of the form $\mathbf{x}^\delta \cdot \epsilon$ for a unit ϵ. Therefore the discriminant is not of this form and thus f is not quasi-ordinary with respect to the projection given by $(\mathbf{x}, z)$. This ends the proof of Proposition 5.1. □

Proposition 4.1 and Proposition 5.1 imply our polyhedral characterization of irreducible quasi-ordinary hypersurface singularities, Theorem 3.10. Moreover, we obtain some deep corollaries. First of all, a new proof for

Theorem 5.6 (Abhyankar-Jung Theorem)**.** *Let $f \in K[[x]][z]$ be a quasi-ordinary Weierstrass polynomial of degree n. Then the roots of f as a polynomial in z lie in $K[[x_1^{\frac{1}{n}}, \dots, x_d^{\frac{1}{n}}]]$.*

Proof. Since f is quasi-ordinary Theorem 3.10 (resp. Proposition 5.1) implies that the invariant $\kappa(f; \mathbf{x}; z)$ ends with ∞. Theorem 4.4 yields then that the roots of f are contained in $K[[x_1^{\frac{1}{n}}, \dots, x_d^{\frac{1}{n}}]]$. □

Further, this reveals that the invariant $\kappa(f; \mathbf{x}; z)$ does not only tell us if a given f is quasi-ordinary, but provides even more information in the quasi-ordinary case. More precisely,

Proposition 5.7. *Let f be quasi-ordinary and irreducible. Then*

$$\kappa(f; \mathbf{x}; z) = (\, v(1);\, v(2);\, \dots;\, v(g);\, \infty\,).$$

then $v(1), \dots, v(g)$ yield the minimal system of generators of the semi-group associated to the quasi-ordinary singularity.

Proof. This is a direct application of Lemma 35 in [GP2]. □

Besides the order of a hypersurface at a point another measure for the complexity of a singularity is the so called log canonical threshold. In [BGG], Theorem 3.1, it was proved that the log canonical threshold of a quasi-ordinary singularity can be computed from the generators of the corresponding semi-group. Therefore we obtain:

Corollary 5.8. *Let f be an irreducible quasi-ordinary hypersurface singularity and $(\mathbf{x}, z)$ such that the last entry of $\kappa(f; \mathbf{x}; z)$ is ∞. Then one can compute from $\kappa(f; \mathbf{x}; z)$ the log canonical threshold of f.*

Remark 5.9. Finally, let us remark that our original approach to the characterization was via [ACLM] . There quasi-ordinary singularities are characterized using the Newton process and Newton trees. One can show that there is a one-to-one correspondence between the Newton process and our construction which yields another proof of our characterization. Nevertheless, as it turned out, we were able to avoid this technical notation and could proof our characterization directly.

Acknowledgements. The authors would like to thank Evelia Garcia-Barroso, Vincent Cossart, Dale Cutkosky, and Bernard Teissier for many stimulating discussions.

References

[A1] S.S Abhyankar *On the ramification of algebraic functions*. Amer. J. Math., Vol. 77, p. 575–592, 1955.

[A2] S.S Abhyankar *Irreducibility criterion for germs of analytic function of two complex variables*. Advances in Mathematics, Vol. 74 (2), p. 190–257, 1989.

[ACLM] E. Artal Bartolo, PI. Cassou-Noguès, I. Luengo, and A. Melle *Quasi-ordinary singularities and Newton trees*. Moscow Mathematical Journal, Vol. 13, No. 3, p. 365–398, 2013.

[As] A. Assi, *Irreducibility criterion for quasi-ordinary polynomials.* J. Singul. 4, p.23–34, 2012.

[BMc] C. Ban, L. McEwan, *Canonical resolution of a quasi-ordinary surface singularity. Canad. J. Math.* **52**, no. 6, p.1149–1163, 2000.

[BM1] E. Bierstone and P. Milman. *Canonical desingularization in characteristic zero by blowing up the maximum strata of a local invariant*. Invent. Math., 128(2), p.207–302, 1997.

[BM2] E. Bierstone and P. Milman. *Resolution of singularities*. Math. Sci. Res. Inst. Publ., 37, p.43–78, 1999.

[BGG] N. Budur, P.D. Gonzàlez-Pérez and M. Gonzlez Villa *Log canonical thresholds of quasi-ordinary hypersurface singularities*. Proc. Amer. Math. Soc., 140, p.4075–4083, 2012.

[CM] H. Cobo and H. Mourtada, *Jet schemes of quasi-ordinary singularities*. Preprint.

[CP] V. Cossart and O. Piltant. *Resolution of Singularities of Arithmetical Threefolds II*. Preprint, HAL:hal-01089140, 2014.

[CS] V. Cossart and B. Schober. *Characteristic polyhedra of singularities without completion - Part II*. preprint, arXiv: 1411.2522, 2014.

[Cu] S.D. Cutkosky, *Resolution of singularities.*. Graduate Studies in Mathematics, 63. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2004.

[GG] E.R. García Barroso, P.D. González Pérez, *Decomposition in bunches of the critical locus of a quasi-ordinary map*. Compositio Math. 141 (2), p.461–486, 2005.

[G] Y-N. Gau, *Embedded Topological classification of quasi-ordinary singularities*. Memoirs of the American Mathematical Society 388, 1988.

[GP1] P.D. González Pérez, *Toric embedded resolutions of quasi-ordinary hypersurface singularities*. Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble), 53 (6), p.1819–1881, 2003.

[GP2] P.D. González Pérez, *The semigroup of a quasi-ordinary hypersurface*. J. Inst. Math. Jussieu, **2** (3), p.383–399, 2003.

[H] H. Hironaka, *Characteristic polyhedra of singularities*. J. Math. Kyoto Univ. 7, p.251–293, 1967.

[J] H.W.E. Jung, *Darstellung der Funktionen eines algebraischen Krpers zweier unabhngigen Vernderlichen x,y in der Umgebung einer Stelle x=a, y=b*. (German) J. Reine Angew. Math. 133, p.289–314, 1908.

[KM] K. Kiyek, M. Micus, *Semigroup of a quasiordinary singularity*. Topics in algebra, Part 2 (Warsaw), p.149–156. Banach Center Publ. 26, 1988.

[KV] K. Kiyek, J.L. Vicente, *On the JungAbhyankar theorem*. Arch. Math. (Basel) 83 (2), p.123–134, 2004.

[LMR] M. Lejeune-Jalabert, H. Mourtada, A. Reguera, *Jet schemes and minimal embedded desingularization of plane branches*. Revista de la Real Academia de Ciencias Exactas, Fisicas y Naturales. Serie A. Matematicas: Volume 107, Issue 1, p.145–157, 2013.

[L] J. Lipman, *Topological invariants of quasi-ordinary singularities*. Memoirs of the American Mathematical Society 388, 1988.

[Lu] I. Luengo, *A new proof of the Jung-Abhyankar theorem*. J. Algebra 85, p.399-409, 1983.

[M] H. Mourtada, *Jet schemes and minimal generating sequences of divisorial valuations in dimension 2*. Preprint, arXiv:1511.03907.

[PR] A. Parusinski, G. Rond, *The Abhyankar-Jung theorem*. J. Algebra 365, p.29–41, 2012.

[S1] B. Schober. *Idealistic exponents and their characteristic polyhedra*. preprint, arXiv: 1410.6541, 2014.

[S2] B. Schober. *A polyhedral approach to the invariant of Bierstone and Milman*. preprint, arXiv: 1410.6543, 2014.

[T] B. Teissier, *Overweight deformations of affine toric varieties and local uniformization*. in "Valuation theory in interaction", Proceedings of the second international conference

on valuation theory, Segovia–El Escorial, 2011. Edited by A. Campillo, F-V. Kuhlmann and B.Teissier. European Math. Soc. Publishing House, Congress Reports Series, Sept. 2014, 474–565.

[V] O. Villamayor, *On equiresolution and a question of Zariski.* Acta Math. 185, no.1, p.123-.159, 2000.

[Y] C. Yuen, *One higher dimensional analog of jet schemes.* Preprint arXiv:math/0608633

Hussein Mourtada, Equipe Géométrie et Dynamique, Institut Mathématique de Jussieu-Paris Rive Gauche, Université Paris 7, Bâtiment Sophie Germain, case 7012, 75205 Paris Cedex 13, France

E-mail address: hussein.mourtada@imj-prg.fr

Bernd Schober, Institut für Algebraische Geometrie, Leibniz Universität Hannover, Welfengarten 1, 30167 Hannover, Germany

E-mail address: schober.math@gmail.com